

REMARKS
OF THE
COMMITTEE
OF THE
Presbytery of GLASGOW,
UPON
Mr. LEECHMAN's
CEREMONIAL on PRAYER,
WITH
His REPLIES thereunto, &c.

To which is prefix'd

HISTORICAL ACCOUNT of the whole
PROCEEDINGS of the said Presbytery
and their Committee; and of the Synod of
Glasgow in that Affair.

non agere non fit per Christum, non solum non potest
clericus peccatum: sed ipsa fit peccatum.

AUGUST. in Psal. 103.

L E D Z I N B U R G H.

Printed by R. STEPHENSON, and A. ALISON. 1744.

GERALD

1578 / 3482

RECEIVED

LIBRARY TO

WOODWARD LIBRARIES

MS. B. 1. 1.

MANUSCRIPT

TELLING LIBRARY

MS. B. 1. 1.

MANUSCRIPT

MS. B. 1. 1.

30.3.80 B.L.



1578 3482.

HISTORICAL P A R T.

IT is with no Pleasure, but with much Grief and Regret, the Reverend Presbytery of Glasgow entered into an Inquiry, Whether a Sermon, published under the Name of the Reverend Mr. William Leechman Minister of the Gospel at Beith, entituled, *The Nature, Reasonableness, and Advantages, of Prayer, &c.* contained such Doctrines, and Ways of Teaching, as gave just Ground to the Offence many had taken against said Sermon?—To the Presbytery's great Surprise and Trouble, they have met with much Reproach, many Difficulties, in their regular and orderly Procedure in this Affair; and, after all their unwearied Labours, to bring this important Affair to as speedy an Issue, as was consistent with the Regard they ought to have, first to Truth, and then to their Brother's Character, they had a Stop put to their Procedure, by the very Reverend Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, in a Way and Manner the Reverend Presbytery conceive highly injurious to the Truth, to the Peace of this Church, and to the Presbytery, as well as unprecedented in this Church, or any where else, since the Reformation.—This hath made it necessary, that the Presbytery should appeal to the Venerable General Assembly of this Church, and cry at their Bar for Justice to Truth and them, against the Procedure of the very Reverend Synod, in this Cause.

A

That

That I may set this Matter in its true Light, before the Members of this Venerable Assembly, and unto the whole World, I shall candidly and impartially, first, Give the History of the Whole, as far as appears needful, for every one to judge of it with Understanding, either in a publick or private Capacity.—2dly, I shall insert the Remarks made by the Committee of the *Presbytery of Glasgow*, together with an Abstract of Reasonings, shewing how the Remarks appear to be justly founded upon the Sermon.—3dly, The Answers given in by the Reverend Mr. *William Leechman*, to the Committee of *Presbytery*, upon *Wednesday the 4th April.*—4thly, The Reason why the Answer to the first Remark was unsatisfying to the Committee; and some few short Remarks upon that and the other Answers, shewing they are far from giving the expected Satisfaction, and removing the great Offence given by the Sermon.

The needful History of this Affair is as follows:

The Reverend Mr. *William Leechman*, while a Probationer, preached frequently in *Glasgow*. He was far from being look'd upon as an Evangelical Preacher. Many good Judges were offended, by his preaching in such a philosophical and abstract Way, as if he had resolved the Reverse of the Apostle *Paul's* Determination, *1 Cor. ii. 2.* All this I heard then, tho' I knew not Mr. *Leechman* by Face for several Years after that. He knoweth also, that some Ministers of the Gospel at *Glasgow* had Reasonings with him, and gave him serious Cautions and Warnings concerning this.—His Sermon before the *Synod of Glasgow and Ayr* did not remove the Discontent; for it was observed by severals, that tho' the Mysteries of Religion, and the Peculiarities of Christianity, were mentioned, yet, both in Prayer and Sermon, it was done in such a sparing Manner, *comparatively* with other Subjects, as if they were but the less principal Objects of Christian Knowledge and Faith.

What increased the Offence, and seemed to warrant it as given, and well founded, was Mr. *Leechman's* publishing a Sermon in the Year 1743, already mentioned.—

This

This Sermon had been preached by him first at *Beith*, in a Month after that at *Edinburgh*, and a third Time, eight Days after that, at *Glasgow*.—It is notorious and known, that many far and near were offended at this Sermon, as soon as published, and long before there could be any Prospect of his being elected Professor of Divinity in the University of *Glasgow*.—Indeed the Offence came to be more general, when he was spoken of as a Candidate for the Divinity-Chair, and afterwards elected by the overruling Vote of the Rector of said University, and was then accompanied with a deep Concern, lest this Election might prove of evil Consequence to the Purity of Doctrine, and the Ministry of this Church.—The Sermon was now more generally read and considered, and consequently a much greater Noise made about it, than what was before.—It was also observed by many, that Sermons without Christ, and consisting of Morality, without that Relation to the Gospel of Christ, (that alone can render it acceptable in the Sight of God) and Preachers of them, were increasing; and they were now afraid, as they continue to be, lest the Youth, taught by the Author of the Sermon in Debate, should come forth rather more exceptionable than their Teacher, as hath been ordinary in such Cases.—The Doctrines, and dangerous Ways of Teaching, appearing to them in this Sermon, led them to think, that it was of unspeakably worse Consequence, to the Interests of Truth and Religion in this Church, than his continuing Minister at *Beith*, or in any other Congregation within this Church.—This gave the immediate Rise to the Information given in to the Presbytery of *Glasgow*, which I shall give the History of, after I have given that of the Events of the preceding Presbytery, relating to this Affair.

The Reverend Presbytery of *Irvine* loosed Mr. Leechman's Relation to the Parish of *Beith*, upon a Demission given in by him, of his pastoral Charge among that People, unto the said Presbytery, upon the third Day of *January* last.—This they did, without any previous Warning given to the said Parish, or summoning them, by the

Presbytery, to answer in a Cause, wherein they were so much and immediately concerned, contrary to the prescribed Forms and laudable Customs of this Church.—What relates to this Event will doubtless be laid before the Venerable Assembly, at greater Length, by the Appellants from this Sentence of the Presbytery of *Irvine*.

On the 4th of *Jany* *yy*, the *Presbytery of Glasgow* being convened in their Ordinary Place of Meeting, to our no small Surprise, and beyond our Expectation, about Twelve of the Clock Forenoon, Mr. *William Leechman*, with Messrs. *Dunlop, Ross, Simson* and *Hamilton*, Professors in the University, appeared before the *Presbytery*, and represented, That the said Mr. *Leechman* being chosen Professor of Divinity in the University of *Glasgow*, and loosed from his Pastoral Charge as Minister of *Beith*, he was now come to sign the *Confession of Faith*, before the said *Presbytery*, as injoin'd by *Act of Parliament*.—The *Presbytery* being infrequent, they delayed proceeding in this Affair, till their Meeting at Four Afternoon: This was intimated to Mr. *Leechman*, &c.—Upon which the said Mr. *Leechman* protested, That he had offered to subscribe the *Confession of Faith*, before the said *Presbytery of Glasgow* now constitute, in Obedience to the *Act of Parliament*; but they giving an Interlocutor, delaying the Matter till Afternoon, he looks upon that Delay as a Refusal: And his other Business not allowing him to attend their Meeting Afternoon; therefore he protested, that his offering to sign as above may be reckoned equal to his Signing, in Construction of Law; and thereupon he took Instruments, and required Extracts. The fore-said Members of University adhered to the said Protest.

After Noon, when the *Presbytery* (being fuller than before Noon) were proceeding to the Consideration of their Minute, as to Mr. *William Leechman's Offer* to sign the *Confession of Faith*, in Consequence of his being elected Professor of Divinity in the University of *Glasgow*, as he pretended; they were acquainted, by one of their Number, that Mr. *Leechman*, and some of the Members of the said University, were attending.—The *Presbytery*

very allowed them to be called in, to know if they had any thing further to offer. — Accordingly Mr. Leechman again appeared before the Presbytery, with George Bogle of Daldowie, Esq; Rector of the University, Messrs. Dunlop, Ross, Hamilton and Simson: Mr. Leechman declared, that he had ordered his Businels so, as to permit him again to attend the Reverend Presbytery at this Time; — and, out of Regard to them, he was content to wave or pass from his former Protest, upon Condition of their accepting his Offer, and allowing him to subscribe the *Confession of Faith* at this Time. — He also produced an Extract of the Act of the University-Meeting of Glasgow, of the 13th of December last 1743, signed by Robert Simson Clerk of said University, nominating and electing the said Mr. William Leechman to be Professor of Divinity in said University: — Also an Extract of the Presbytery of Irvine's Act, of the Date the 3d of January instant, accepting of his Demission of his Pastoral Charge of Beith, and loosing his Relation to the said Parish, signed by John Adam Presbytery-clerk. — And he, the said Mr. William Leechman, did renew his Offer to the said Presbytery, to sign the *Confession of Faith* before them, as he was enjoined by Law. — The Presbytery had the foresaid two Extracts read before them.

After this, Mr. Leechman, and foresaid Rector and Masters, being removed, a Member of the Presbytery alledged, that the Extract of the Presbytery of Irvine's Proceedings, produced by Mt. Leechman, was not full; and that it gave the Presbytery a very indistinct, partial and imperfect View of the Affair of the Loosing of Mr. Leechman's Relation to the Parish of Beith, by the Reverend Presbytery of Irvine; and could not mislead the Presbytery, as to their Judgment of the Right Mr. Leechman pretended to have, to demand Allowance of the Presbytery to sign the *Confession of Faith*; there being several Protests against, and Appeals from, the said Presbytery (their Interlocutors and Sentences in their Procedure in loosing Mr. Leechman's Relation to the Parish

of Beith) to the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr.—This the foreaid Member offered to instruct, by a full and complete Extract of the Presbytery of Irvine's Procedure in the Loosing of Mr. Leechman's Relation, which the said Member declared he was ready to produce, signed by the Clerk of the Presbytery of Irvine.—Then the Presbytery agreed to put it to the Vote, *Allow the said offered Extract to be produced and read, or not*: And, the Vote being put, it carried, by a great Majority, in the Affirmative.—The said Extract was accordingly produced, and read.

In the after Reasoning it was observed, that, from this Extract, which gave the Presbytery a fair and full View of the whole Affair, it appeared evident, that Mr. Leechman's Election, to be Professor of Divinity, was controverted.—Also that there were three several Protests and Appeals to the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, taken against so many Interlocutors and Sentences of the Presbytery of Irvine, in their Procedure in this Affair, and one of them particularly from the Presbytery's Sentence loosing Mr. Leechman's Relation to the Parish of Beith.

—And that therefore the Presbytery of Glasgow cannot look upon him as Professor of Divinity in the University of Glasgow, or that his Relation was loosed as above, until the Controversy anent his Election was decided before the proper Judges, and the Appeals against loosing his Relation discussed before the Synod, by their confirming the Presbytery of Irvine's Sentence:—And consequently cannot admit him, at this Time, to sign the Confession of Faith, as Professor of Divinity.—After much Reasoning amongst the Members of the Presbytery, it was proposed to put the following Vote; viz. Allow Mr. Leechman now to sign the Confession of Faith, as Professor of Divinity, or not, until the Synod should judge of the Appeals made unto them, in the Loosing his Relation.—But there being a Quality offered by some of the Brethren, to be adjected to the first Branch of the Question, in these Words; viz. Providing the Allowance shall not be understood as an Approbation of his

Election

Election as Professor of Divinity, nor of the Procedure of the Presbytery of *Irvine*. — The Presbytery agreed to this previous Vote; Whether the said Quality should be adjected, or the Vote should be put simply as before stated.— And, the said previous Vote being put, it carried by a great Majority, Not to adject the said Quality; but that the State of the Vote should be simply as above-mentioned.— After which, this State of the Question being put to the Vote, — it carried, by a great Majority, in the Negative, *viz.* *Not to allow the said Mr. Leechman to sign the Confession of Faith now, in respect of the foresaid Appeals to the Synod, not discuss.*

After this, the said Mr. William Leechman was called in, with the Rector and other Masters before named of the University, and the foresaid Sentence intimated to them. — The said Mr. William Leechman, conceiving himself, as he said, lesed thereby, protested against the same, and took Instruments thereof in the Hands of the Clerk of Presbytery, as also in the Hands of a publick Notary he had brought alongst with him.— His Protest was much in the following Words: — *I Mr. William Leechman, elected Professor of Divinity in the University of Glasgow, having this Day compeared before the Reverend Presbytery of Glasgow, in order to sign the Confession of Faith, as I am ordained by Law to do; and having produced, before the said Reverend Presbytery, an Extract of an Act of the University of Glasgow, electing me to be Professor of Divinity, and an Extract of an Act of the Presbytery of Irvine, loosing me from the Parish of Beith;— And the Reverend Presbytery of Glasgow having, by their present Act, refused to admit me to sign the said Confession of Faith: Do hereby protest, That the said Refusal is contrary to Law;— and that my not signing the said Confession of Faith is through no Default of mine;— and that therefore I shall be held and repute, in all Respects, as if I had signed the same.— And further declare, that I am ready and willing to sign the said Confession, at any other Meeting of the said Presbytery, when lawfully called*

called thereto. — And craved Extracts of this Protest. — To this Protest the above-named Rector and Masters adhered.

On Wednesday the first of February, an Elder, who was also a Member of the Presbytery, in his own Name, and in the Name of many other Elders and People, informed the Presbytery, that there was great Offence taken against the Sermon so often now named, and desired that the Presbytery should make Inquiry into it, if there was Ground for it or not. — I am certainly informed, that there was a Design to have demanded this of the Presbytery, by great Numbers of Elders and People, both from the City of Glasgow, and from the Country, by Way of Petition: But they were diverted from it, as what might have been followed with evil Consequences, in case of the Presbytery's Refusal. — And, indeed, we could not but think this Application peaceable, dutiful, and sufficiently founded upon the Scripture, and what the Presbytery could not in Duty slight. *For the Priest's Lips should keep Knowledge, and they should seek the Law at his Mouth: For he is the Messenger of the Lord of Hosts, Mal. ii. 7.* It would have been shocking, if a Presbytery should have refused to satisfy any Number of People, demanding, Whether they might pray as taught in that Sermon, and safely embrace the Doctrines thereof? — And this is what makes (in the Opinion of some) the Sentence of the Synod, declaring the Sermon sound and orthodox, more to be complained of; seeing they still conceive, that Praying, as described in that Sermon, can never please God. — The Presbytery, after much Deliberation, and various Proposals, appointed a Committee of their Number to take Inspection of the said Sermon, upon the *fama clamosa* (they now learned, both from the Members already named, and other Members) there was of Things offensive in the said Sermon. — I was named one of the said Committee, which Mr. Leechman hath since made Ground of Complaint against the Presbytery, because I, in particular, declared in strong Terms that Day, that I was much dissatisfied with said Sermon;

and

and yet one of his principal Friends in the Presbytery voted for my being a Member of the Committee.— I proposed, that all the Members of the Presbytery, tho' they were not obliged, by Appointment, to attend, might, if they pleased, sit and act as Members of the Committee, which was accordingly appointed ; — in consequence of which, the most of the Members of the Presbytery met and acted in the Committee.— The Presbytery appointed the Committee to meet upon the *Monday* and *Tuesday*, being the fifth and sixth Days of *March*, immediately preceding *Wednesday* the eleventh of *March*, being the ordinary stated Day of the Presbytery's Meeting.— They also expressly instructed the Committee, that in case they found Ground for the Offence taken at the mentioned Sermon, they should call for Professor Leechman, and converse with him, to see what Satisfaction he offered ; and this, before they should make any Report to the Presbytery.— And this is sufficient to shew the Injustice of the Clamour raised against the Presbytery, by Mr. Leechman's Friends, because the Presbytery had not conversed with him, before they appointed the Committee to take Inspection of the Sermon for the forementioned Purposes.— It is evident, they could not call for a Communing with him, until they should find, presbyterially, that there appeared to them Things offensive in the said Sermon.— Whatever particular Members judged, the Presbytery had not found this, neither have they found it to this Day.— And the Committee were appointed for this very End, to prevent this Affair coming to a Process against Mr. Leechman, hoping, that if Things censurable should be found, the Professor might satisfy their Committee ; in which Report the Presbytery would have rejoiced.

In the Interval, between the Meeting of the Presbytery and Committee, there were all Methods used, by Persons pretending to be Friends to Mr. Leechman, and his Cause, to intimidate the Members of the Committee to proceed in this Affair.— There were scandalous *Libels* and *Advertisements* spread against some of them ; there were

incendiary anonymous Letters written to others, threatening, that, in case the Committee, or Presbytery, should find any Thing culpable in the Sermon, they would make *Reprisals*, and publish *slanderous Falshoods* (they condescended on, or insinuate) at London, against several they particularly named, in the University and Presbytery.

The Committee met, and made Procedure in the Inquiry appointed, with much Reasoning and Deliberation.— Upon Monday, the 5th of ~~July~~ the Committee consisted of Ten Ministers and Elders.— Upon Tuesday, the 6th, the Committee consisted of Nine Ministers and five Elders. The Committee agreed to report to the Presbytery, That they had made some Progress, and to move, that they might have Liberty to sit again: As also to desire, that (in regard two Members of the Committee were in such Circumstances, as could not allow them to meet with the Committee) some others might be appointed in their Stead.

This Report was made to the Presbytery on the 7th; accordingly they added the Reverend Messrs. Ouchterlony, William Maxwell, and John Warden, to the former special Committee, allowing, as formerly, that every other Member of the Presbytery might sit and act, if they pleased: And appointed the Committee to meet that Afternoon, and to finish their Inquiry, so as to be able to report to the next Presbytery to meet upon the 21st of the current Month.

In Obedience to the last Appointment, the Committee met *hora quinta post meridiem*, consisting of seven or eight Ministers, and five Elders, and continued their Sederunt to about Ten of the Clock.— They adjourned to the 8th current, at Nine o'Clock in the Morning, appointing the Place of their Meeting to be at the North-West Kirk Session house, as lying near by Mr. Leechman's Lodgings, in case they should call for a Communing with him.

In the Morning of the 8th, I desired a Member of the Presbytery, who had lived, and continueth to live, in much

much Friendship with the Professor, to desire of him, that he would not be out of the Way that Forenoon, because it was probable, the Committee might finish their Remarks in such Time, as to desire Communing with him, according to the Appointment of the Presbytery. — But he said, He was perluaded Mr. Leechman would not be out of the Way; — and I am sure, his not complying with my Request, was out of no evil Intention against Mr. Leechman.

The Committee met, at the Time and Place appointed, consisting of six Ministers and four Elders. — They finished the reading, considering, and making Observes upon the Sermon, about One of the Clock Afternoon. — They resolved to call for Mr. Leechman; and, as to the Method of Communing with him, agreed to read to him the Observations they had made upon his Sermon, and to take down in Writing his Answers, if he gave any, without entering into any Dispute with him by making Replies. — Accordingly Mr. Leechman was sent for to his Lodgings; and, not being there, to other Places; but was not found. Several of the present Members of the *Special Committee* declaring, that their Affairs were such, as they could not be in Town before or at the next Presbytery, and no sooner than the Week following, when the Holy Supper was to be given at Glasgow: The Meeting therefore agreed to report to the Presbytery, that they had finished their Remarks upon the Sermon, but had not met with Mr. Leechman, at thdir last Sederunt, and that they had adjourned their next Meeting unto the ~~10~~ of April, at Five of the Clock Afternoon, it being the Monday after giving the Holy Supper at Glasgow, when many Brethren would be in the Town; to which Meeting the Moderator was to desire Mr. Leechman's Attendance. — This Adjournment being made, if the Reverend Presbytery should approve of it.

The Presbytery met upon Wednesday the 21st of March. The foregoing Report was made to them. They continued the Committee, and appointed they should meet according to their foresaid Adjournment. — Mr. Leech-

man

man appeared before the *Presbytery*, and desired they would read to him what was in their Minutes relating to his Sermon upon Prayer. The *Presbytery* granted his Desire; and he protested to have Leave to complain to the *Synod*, for Injury done him, by the Procedure of the said *Presbytery*, promising to give in the Reasons of his Complaint in due Time; whereupon he took Instruments in the *Presbytery Clerk's* Hands.—The *Presbytery* appointed their Committee to draw up Answers to the fore-said Reasons, when given in.

Upon Monday, the 2d Day of *April*, the Committee of *Presbytery*, according to their former Adjournment, met in the North-West Kirk-Session-house. They resolved, that if Mr. *Leechman*, after hearing their *Remarks*, should give verbal Answers, to take them down in Writing; but if he should demand a Copy of the *Remarks*, and Time to draw up Answers, it should be granted to him. Accordingly Mr. *Leechman* appeared before the Committee, and having heard their *Remarks* read unto him, he demanded a Copy of them, and Time to draw up Answers, which, he declared, he could not pretend to judge of, and give Answers to, *extempore*.—This was granted to him, according to the above-mentioned Resolve of the Committee; and the Clerk appointed to give it as soon as he could.

It cannot be taken amiss, that I here make the following short Reflections:—*First*, That the Capacity of the Reverend *Synod* far exceeded that of Professor *Leechman*, for they could judge both the Committee's *Remarks*, and the Professor's *Answers extempore*, and without any Forethought, or previous Deliberation.—*2dly*, That Mr. *Leechman's* Complaint against the *Presbytery* is not fair or ingenuous, as if the Committee were to oblige him to answer *extempore*, and to refuse him a Copy of their *Remarks*, when he should be called to commune with them, and that because, as he alledgedeth, a Member of the *Presbytery* had desired it of the Committee at a former Meeting, and which they had unanimously refused: Tho', for my Part, I remember no such Proposal and Refusal, and now

now find no such in the Minutes; besides, it was Time enough to grant it, when Mr. Leechman should declare to the Committee he wanted it, and should ask it of them. Both the Complaint against the Presbytery, and what Mr. Leechman said before the Committee, anent his Inability to answer the Committee's elaborate Remarks, as he calls them, without a Copy and Time, are the more surprising, that he had from the Committee's Meeting, upon the 8th of March, a Copy of the Committee's Remarks, by the Favour of the Moderator of the Presbytery, and which neither I, nor any other Member of the Presbytery or Committee ever quarreled.— This accounts sufficiently for the Professor's great Ability in composing his long elaborate *Answers* to the Committee's Remarks, in such a short Time, as from Monday Eight o'Clock at Night, to Wednesday Five o'Clock in the Afternoon, tho' the Tuesday and Wednesday, from Morning to late at Night, were spent in Meetings of the Synod, and its Committees, where the Professor punctually attended.— Did he not unduly delay his own Affair, in not giving in these *Answers* to the Committee, Monday's Night, when it is presumable he had them ready?

It was resolved in the Committee, That, in regard Mr. Leechman's Complaint was no Appeal, and therefore did not fist the Presbytery as Parties before the Synod, neither were they under Summons to answer to the said Complaint before the Synod; they would not so far submit to an Illegality, which might be an evil Precedent, and followed with Consequences highly prejudicial to Justice in this Church, as to take any Notice of the said Complaint, when given in to the Committee of Bills, or appear as Parties before the Synod.

Upon Tuesday, the 3d of April, the Synod met: In their first Sederunt they shewed great Partiality towards Mr. Leechman; for they appoint him to be inrolled in the Number of the Presbytery of Glasgow, tho' it was twice reclaimed against; tho' it was notour, there was an Appeal from the Sentence of the Presbytery of Irvine, loosing his Relation from the Parish of Beith, and tho' they

they knew he was not admitted a Member of the Presbytery of Glasgow.—For they gave this as one of the Reasons of their Sentence, taking the Inquiry out of the Hands of the Presbytery of Glasgow into their own Hands, That Professor Leechman was a Member of their Court, but not admitted as yet a Member of the Presbytery of Glasgow; — and yet they themselves, in their very first Sederunt, find him a Member of the Presbytery of Glasgow, by inserting his Name in the Roll of that Presbytery. — It is none of the Presbytery's Business to reconcile this Conduct.

The Committee of Bills was appointed to meet that Afternoon, before the Afternoon-Meeting of the Synod; a Thing never done before in our Remembrance. The Reason was guessed at, and it soon appeared.

In the Post-meridian Meeting of the Synod, the Moderator of the Committee for Bills informed the Synod, that the Committee had transmitted to the Synod a Protestation and Complaint, given in by Mr. William Leechman Professor of Divinity in the University of Glasgow, against the Presbytery of Glasgow, and some Proceedings of that Presbytery against him. — The Complaint was taken in by the Synod; but the Presbytery of Glasgow, by several of their Members, declared, that they could not sift themselves, as Parties, before the Synod, to answer to this Complaint, in regard they were neither sifted by Appeal nor Summons; and no Person was obliged to answer to any Complaint before a Court, without legal Warning and Summons.— After long Reasoning, the Synod proceeded to frame an Interlocutor, finding the Presbytery of Glasgow obliged to answer as Parties; but, observing a Member of the Presbytery ready to protest and appeal, they dropt their Sentence they were framing, and rested in this General, That they would take in this Affair at their first Dye To-morrow.

The Presbytery of Glasgow met, after the Rising of the Synod. — It was moved by some Members, That, to stop the Mouth of Clamour, and to prevent People's receiving bad Impressions from Mr. Leechman's Complaint,

it might be adviseable to give in Answers to the said Complaint ; and, waving Forms of Justice, to plead before the *Synod* ; seeing that the Assembly might afterwards declare themselves dissatisfy'd with the *Synod's* Conduct, in breaking in upon the essential Forms of Justice, and the Liberties of the Subject, by their forcing the *Presbytery* to answer before them in such an unprecedented Manner. This was agreed to ; and a Member of the *Presbytery* produced a Paper, containing Answers to Professor *Leechman's* Complaint, which was read, amended, and approved of ;—and a Member of the *Presbytery*, who was also a Member of the Committee of Bills, was appointed to give it in to the Bills, to be transmitted by them to the *Synod*, at their first Meeting To-morrow.

Mr. *Leechman's* Complaint against the *Presbytery* consists of no special Article against any Sentence of the *Presbytery* of *Glasgow* passed against him, in relation to his Sermon upon Prayer, tho' his Complaint be restricted to their Proceedings in that Affair.

The first Reason of his Complaint is, The Prejudice they had shewed against him, from the Time of his Election,—by refusing to allow him to sign the *Confession of Faith*, according to Act of Parliament. — The Insufficiency of this Reason appears, from the Reasons of the *Presbytery* refusing it, set down at large in the former Part of this History.

The 2d Reason is, The *Presbytery* appointing a Member on the Committee, who had uttered several outrageous and abusive Speeches against Mr. *Leechman*, and had shewn himself his Adversary and Accuser ; and that the *Presbytery* had not censured him for said Expressions, of which all the Instances he could gather are given, and complained of, to the *Synod*. — The principal Answers were,—That the strong Expressions used by the foresaid Member, were uttered against Mr. *Leechman's* Sermon, and not against his Person ; — That the foresaid Person had manifold worse Reflections cast upon his Person, by Mr. *Leechman's* Friends in the *Presbytery*, which he Christianly

Christianly and generously forgave, tho' the *Presbytery* took no Notice of them; — That if the forelaid Person was dissatisfied with the Sermon, he was much fitter to be upon the Inquiry, that he might either receive Satisfaction from others, or assist to find out the Truth; — That Mr. *Leechman* had made no Complaint to the *Presbytery*, of any Injury done him by the Person complained of, nor had they refused to do him Justice; — And, finally, that forelaid Person disowns the Expressions as read as false and calumnious; and reserves Liberty to himself to pursue Mr. *Leechman* for Calumny and Slander, when and where he shall find most just.

His 3d Reason of Complaint is, The *Presbytery's* transgressing the Rules of this Church, such, as *Form of Process*, Chap. 7. Sect. 4. and Sect. 3d of the said Chapter; — and that the *Presbytery* had not made this Inquiry sooner, the Sermon having been published nine or ten Months before, and undergone a second Edition. — The principal Answers to this are, — That the *Presbytery* have as yet entered into no Process against Professor *Leechman*; — That all they had done was no more than a Precognition; — That their Proceedings hitherto, even in this Precognition, went upon a *fama clamosa*; — That they needed not inquire into the Rise, &c. of this; for it is evident, the Publishers and Spreaders of the Sermon gave the Rise to this; — That there was no Need to speak to Mr. *Leechman* before any such Inquiry, — it being no Process, and relating to a Sermon published to the whole World, and every-where offensive to many serious Christians; — And that the *Presbytery* of *Glasgow* was under no more Obligation to inquire into the said Sermon, than any other Presbytery in *Scotland*; except the *Presbytery* of *Irvine*, until he came to reside in their Bounds.

His 4th Reason of Complaint is, Undue Delay of the Committee to bring this Inquiry into a Conclusion, so as Mr. *Leechman* might have no Opportunity to appeal to the *Synod*, if he found himself injured by the final Sentence of the *Presbytery*. — If the Committee and *Presbytery* had used the *Synod's Dispatch*, in an Af-

fair of so great Importance, both to Truth and the Peace of this Church, as also to Mr. Leechman's Character, there would have been just Ground of Complaint; — but, 'tis hoped, the plain simple Relation given above, of the Proceedings of the Committee and Presbytery, will satisfy every impartial Person of the Injustice of the Charge, and will stop the Mouths of others.

Next Morning the Presbytery's Answers to Mr. Leechman's Complaint, having been given in to the Committee for Bills, and were by them transmitted to the Synod; tho' no Notice be taken of this in the Synod Minutes.

In this Sederunt of the Synod, 4th of April, the Professor's Complaint, Presbytery Minutes, which were very short, the Reasons of his Complaint, and Presbytery Answers, were read. — The Presbytery of Glasgow, and some Members of it, suffered much from the Partiality of the Synod, and several of its Members. — Some very injurious Reflections were cast out against the Reverend Presbytery, by some Members, and which a Member of the Synod, in an after Sederunt, observed to the Synod, were much worse than any Expressions, Mr. Leechman complained, had been uttered by a Member of the Presbytery against him, for which he complains against the Presbytery for Partiality, because they had not censured said Member, tho' Mr. Leechman had never complained to them; and yet several Members of the Presbytery, tho' they presently complained to the Synod of foresaid Expressions, could have no Redress. — It was observed by the Member complained of, and who was now declared, by Mr. Leechman, and his two Presbytery Adherents, to be Mr. Robe, he the said Mr. Robe observed to the Synod, that the great Part of Mr. Leechman's Complaint against the Presbytery, consisted of a scandalous Libel against Mr. Robe; — That Mr. Leechman had really broken the Form of Process founded upon plain Scripture Rules, which he wrongfully charges upon the Presbytery; for he had never spoken to Mr. Robe of these Grounds of Complaint, before this Libel given in against him to the Synod; and yet he and his Par-

ty had made a terrible Outcry against the Presbytery for this, tho' without Ground. — 2dly, That Mr. Robe was only bound to answer to the said Libel before his own Presbytery, *prima instantia*, and that he could not be obliged to answer before the Synod at this Time: — Only, for vindicating himself, he declared, that the Charge against him was false and injurious; — yet, notwithstanding of all this, the Synod shewed such Partiality, as, without any further Ceremony, to proceed, at Mr. Leechman's Desire, to expiscate and examine Witnesses upon it — particularly, the Moderator of the Synod, at Mr. Leechman's Desire, and some Members of the Synod backing it, called up the Moderator of the Presbytery of Glasgow, and began to examine him, if he had heard Mr. Robe say in the Committee, *That he was aiming not only at the Author of the Sermon, but at an Arminian, Socinian, Arian and deistical Club, of which the Author was Head, or Member or Tool, or Words to that Purpose.* To which the Moderator answered, That he heard Mr. Robe utter no such Expressions, and cleared him in the Audience of the whole Synod. — This was so surprising, that they desisted from any further Examination of Witnesses. Mr. Robe was going to protest, and appeal to the Assembly; but did not insist upon the Synod's giving over their illegal Inquiry.

After Parties on both Sides, and intermingling Members of the Synod had Spoke much, a Motion was made by a Member of the Presbytery of Glasgow; that the Presbytery should meet that Afternoon and receive the Answers, Professor Leechman should be ready to give in to the Remarks made by the Committee of Presbytery, and after considering these Answers, to give some Judgement concerning them, either by declaring themselves satisfied with them, or not satisfied with them, or to refer the whole Affair to the Synod to Morrow. — This Meeting of the Presbytery, and the Committee of Presbytery to receive in what Answers Professor Leechman should offer, and to judge of these Answers as far as could well be done, was given way to by other Members of Presbytery present.

ent, after some Exceptions, and Limitations; this Meeting the *Synod* allowed off, but appointed not.—The Committee of *Presbytery* was called by the Moderator of the *Presbytery of Glasgow*, to Meet *pro re nata* in Mr. *Sterling's Session House*, at four of the Clock afternoon, and the *Presbytery* to meet in the same Place, half an Hour afterward. This was Intimate from the Chair, at the Desire of the *Presbytery of Glasgow*.—The *Synod* suspended any further Procedure in this Cause until to Morrow when a Report was to be made at the first *Sederunt*, by the *Presbytery of Glasgow*.

At four o'Clock Afternoon, the Committee of the *Presbytery* met, in the Place appointed, according to the Call of their Moderator: There were eleven Ministers present, and no fewer Elders.—The Moderator represented to them, that having been informed, that Professor *Leechman's Answers* to the Committees Observes on his Sermon were ready: He the Moderator had called them to receive these Answers, as they knew by the Intimation made by the Moderator of the *Synod* at his Desire.—The Committee unanimously approved of their Moderators calling them for the Purpose mentioned, and as to Time and Place.—Accordingly Mr. *Leechman* appeared in the Committee, produced and subscribed Answers to the Committees Remarks upon his Sermon, and having read them over in the Committee, delivered them to the Clerk. The Committee considering, that the *Presbytery's Instructions* to them, obliged them to give some Judgement upon the Professors Answers, whether they were satisfying or not, when they should make their Report to the *Presbytery*; They resolved to Read through the first of their Remarks, and Professor *Leechman's Answer* to it, and after judging whether the Answers were satisfying or not, proceed to the second Remark and Answer, and so forward.—After about three Hours Reasoning.—or very long Reasoning, it was agreed to put the following Question, *satisfied with said first Answer or not?* it carried *not satisfied*.—Several Members of the Committee declared they were not clear to Vote,

either satisfied or dissatisfied; after all that they had heard, unless they had Copies of the Professor's Answers, and some Time to deliberate upon them: And therefore they declined to Vote at this Time.

It being now late the Committee found it would be Impracticable for them to make further Procedure for this Night.—And therefore agreed to give in to the Presbytery their Remarks upon Mr. Leechman's Sermon, his Answers to their Remarks, and their procedure in Judgment as far as they had come.—It is to be remembred, that Professor Leechman, when he gave his Answers to the Committee, told them that he had no other Copy of his Answers, besides what he had given into the Committee, and therefore that he might be allowed afterwards a Copy of them, which it was but reasonable to grant.—It is also highly presumable, that Professor Leechman might have given in these very Answers, upon Munday's Night, when he was with the Committee, and had their Remarks read to him.—It was at least past nine at Night before the Committee adjourned: He could not well have the Copy of the Committees Remarks from the Clerk until next Morning. The Synod's Sermon began at ten Forenoon, the Meetings of the Synod and of the Committee of Bills where Professor Leechman was, continued at least unto nine at Night, with a very short Interval.—Upon the Wednesday he was present in a very long Sederunt, there was only about an Hour and half from the Synods Rising, to the Meeting of the Committee of our Presbytery, when Mr. Leechman gave in a clean correct Copy of his Answers. Where was the Time for composing these Answers, if they had not been ready before? Let every impartial Person judge, whether there was Cause for his Complaint against the Reverend Presbytery for imposing a necessity upon him, to make extempory Answers to the Committees elaborate Remarks, and for designed Delays? And if he himself was not the Cause of Delay, for these Days mentioned, by not giving in his Answers to the Committees Remarks as soon as he could?

The Presbytery being constitute, the Committee made
the

the aforesaid Report, and gave in their Remarks upon Mr. Leechman's Sermon, with his Answer to the Remarks.—They reported that they had not sufficient Time to make any Judgment upon the Professor's Answers, besides the first, wherewith they declared themselves dissatisfied.—The *Presbytery* ordered the Remarks and Answers to be read, which accordingly was done. They found that they could not with Judgment declare at the Time, and without further Deliberation, whether they were satisfied or dissatisfied with Professor Leechman's Answers. And therefore as it was proposed by some, that the Presbytery should refer the whole Affair to the *Synod*; others again could not see any good Reason why they should refer it to the *Synod*, for even those who were for referring it, did not think that there was any great Intricacy in the Affair, yea two of them, a Minister and Elder, looked upon the Committees Remarks as groundless. Besides by the Majority, it was thought, that referring it; especially after the Keenes appearing amongst several Members of the *Synod*, would be a tacit Acknowledgment, that Mr. Leechman had Reason for the very irregular Complaint, he had made of the *Presbytery*, and some of their Members, to the *Synod*, which they looked upon as highly injurious. Further they could not see how it was possible for the *Synod* in the short Time they could be together, with Judgement to decide this Affair, especially after the Declaration, several Members of the *Presbytery* had made, that it would be needful for them to have Copies of the Remarks and Answers to deliberate upon them for some Time, before they could give their Judgment as became Members of such a Judicature: And therefore they could not see how the Members of such a great Body as the *Synod*, who had no previous Acquaintance with the Cause, could with decency and Judgement decide it at this Time. 'Tis true indeed, that at first Sight, to reason from our Incapacity to Judge in our Circumstances in a short Time, to the Incapacity of several Members of the *Synod* whose Circumstances were much worse to Judge

in such a short or even shorter Time, may appear to be Self-conceit and Arrogance in the Members of the Presbytery : But its hoped that whosoever take more than a first sight View, will think our way of Reasoning was just, and no ways Immodest.—It was therefore propoed, that the Clerk shoule caule write out Copies of the Committees Remarks, and of the Professors Answers, at the Expence of every Member of the Presbytery who should call for them, that they might consider carefully the Professors Answers, and be ripe to give their Judgement, whether they were satisfying, or not, at the next Meeting of the Presbytery. And that the Presbytery should be appointed to meet and continue their Meetings from Day to Day, until they should bring this Affair to such a Conclusion, as if Mr Leechman should think himself injured by their Sentence, he might have Room to apply to the General Assembly to meet in May first to come, which they would not oppole but rather joyn with him to have it taken in, by the honourable Assembly, tho' the Synod was passed.—After oong Reasoning, the Presbytery came to this State of a Vote, *Refer the Affair to the Synod, or appoint a Day for considering it further before the Presbytery in order to bring it to an issue as soon as Possible.*—It carried by a great Majority appoint.— There being only six Members of at least twenty four, who voted Refer.—I am indeed uncertain about one Vote, so that seven at the utmost voted Refer.—And therefore the Presbytery appointed Tuesday the seventeenth instant for the purpose above mentioned ; revolving to continue their Sederunts, till they bring the Affair to a Conclusion.— They also appointed Copies of the Remarks and Answers to be written for the Use of the Members of the Presbytery, that they may be ripe to give their Judgement against that Day.

The Presbytery after this, unanimously appointed and impowered their Moderator, or any other Member of the Presbytery to appeal in their Name from the Sentence of the Synod to the next General Assembly.—In Case the Synod should take this Affair under their Cognizance before

fore the *Presbytery* had judg'd in it.—In Case the *Synod* should judge *prima instantia* of the Libel contain'd in the Complaint, against one of their Number.—And lastly in case the Reverend *Synod* should command their Clerk to deliver unto them the Papers. The *Presbytery* was dismissed about eleven at Night.

Upon the fifth of *April* in the Forenoon, the preceeding Resolutions of the *Presbytery* were reported to the *Synod* by the Moderator of the *Presbytery*.—It was further reported to the *Synod* by Messrs. *John Hamilton* and *William Craig* Ministers, and *John Bowman* Elder, That as they and some other Members of the *Presbytery* had voted to refer this Affair to the Reverend *Synod*, so these three desired it to be marked in the Minutes, that they had voted Refer.

Mr. *Leechman* craved, that since the *Presbytery* had refused to refer his Affair to the *Synod*, the Reverend *Synod* would now proceed to take his Protestation and Complaint under their Consideration, and give Judgement upon it, to which the *Synod* agreed.

Mr. *Robe* made the following Protestation, which he desired might be entred into the Minutes of the *Synod*, and thereupon took Instruments in the Clerks Hands, viz.

‘I Mr. *James Robe* Minister at *Kilsyth* in entring on
 ‘the Pleadings this Day in the Cause of Mr. *Leechman* a-
 ‘gainst the *Presbytery of Glasgow*, which really contains
 ‘a Calumnious Libel, against a Minister of the said Pres-
 ‘bytery; which was Yesterday explained to be me the
 ‘said Mr. *Robe*, do hereby protest that my Pleadings in
 ‘said Cause, both Yesterday and to Day, shall not be con-
 ‘structed, as my submitting to the *Synod*, as my Judges
 ‘*prima Instantia*, in that Libel; nor prejudge my Right
 ‘of entring a Complaint against the said Mr. *Leechman*
 ‘before his immediate Judges for the said Calumnious Li-
 ‘bel, which he shall never be able to prove: especially
 ‘considering that several in the *Synod*, shewed such Par-
 ‘tiality, that by their their Influence the Moderator used
 ‘repeated Endeavours to expiscate Testimonies in the Face
 ‘of the *Synod*, to prove the said callumnious Libel against
 ‘me,

'me, notwithstanding my repeated reclaiming against such Proceedings, and offering to Protest against it, and even the Testimony of one of the Witnesses was actually taken, after Mr. Leechman desired it, without asking me, if I had any Thing to object." — To this Protestation I find in the *Synod Minutes*, the Moderator replies, that so far as he was concerned, he had done nothing, but by the express Direction of the *Synod*. — This Answer I do not controvert, and adduce it as an Evidence, not of the partiality of the Moderator with whom the *Preskytery of Glasgow* and I have no Controversy; but of the Partiality of the *Synod*, against whom we cry for Justice to the venerable Assembly.

Then the Papers concerning this Cause were read before the *Synod*. — Several very extraordinary Speeches were made in the *Synod*, which I desire to forget, and which for the sake of the Character of the Speakers, I could wish may be forgotten, by the many who were stumbled at them. The Issue of all was in this strange Sentence. Namely, "The *Synod* considering the Grounds of the Professor's Complaint, the importance of the Cause, the necessity of making Dispatch in it, and that the Reverend Professor was a Member their Court, tho' not admitted yet by the *Presbytery of Glasgow* into their Number, (*by the by*, the *Synod* at the beginning had insert him in the Roll of the *Presbytery of Glasgow*) agreed to Call for the Remarks made by the Committee of the *Presbytery of Glasgow*, upon the Professor's Sermon, and the Professor's Answers to them, to be laid before the *Synod*." — Parties being called in, this Sentence of the *Synod* was intimate to them. — Professor Leechman declared his great Satisfaction in the *Synods* Sentence, and gave them his hearty Thanks for it, as well he might. — He also gave into the Clerks Hands a Copy of his Sermon, a Copy of the Remarks made upon it by the Committee; and a Copy of his Answers to the same, subscribed by his own Hand, and thereupon took Instruments in the Clerks Hands. — I cannot miss to observe, that Professor Leechman when he gave in his Answers

swers to the Committee in the Evening before, said he had no other Copy, and therefore desired that he might have a Copy of his Answers, when he should demand it.—It was about Eleven at Night when the *Presbytery* dismissed.—And now, next Day, in the Close of the Forenoon's Sederunt, he gives in a signed Copy of his Answers to the *Synod*.—In the Afternoon Meeting I desired him to explain to me, how his giving in a different Copy, from that given in to our *Presbytery* at the Forenoon Meeting of the *Synod*, was consistent with what he had declared in the Committee Yesternight, that he had no other Copy; to this I got no satisfying Answer.—The Reader may see the Story of *Episcopius*; he gave in the only Copy of his Oration to the *Synod of Dort*, and yet in the Afternoon he gave another Copy to the Secretary of the Deputies of the States, which occasioned afterwards a good deal of Altercation between the *Synod* and *Episcopius*.

Mr. John Gillies, Moderator of the *Presbytery*, took an Appeal, in the *Presbytery's Name*, and by their Appointment, from this Sentence of the *Synod*, to the next General Assembly, &c.—Declaring at the same Time, that he took this Appeal as the *Presbytery's Servant*, and in no other Capacity.—Messrs. John Hamilton, William Craig, and Collin Campbell, Ministers, and John Bowman Elder, declared their Acquiescence in the *Synod's Sentence*, and their Dissent from the Appeal taken by the Moderator of the *Presbytery*, and in the *Presbytery's Name*.

Then the *Synod* required the Moderator of the *Presbytery of Glasgow* to deliver unto them, at their next Meeting, Copies of the Committee of *Presbytery's Remarks*, and Professor Leechman's Answers, as they were to enter upon that Affair in the Afternoon's Sederunt; And the *Synod* adjourned to Seven o'Clock at Night.

I refer to the Reasons of Appeal given by the *Presbytery of Glasgow*, and to the Facts here narrated, evidencing the great Partiality of the *Synod*, and how much Reason the *Presbytery* had to appeal from their

Sentence.—Many Members of the *Synod* shewed an uncommon Keenness to have this Affair before them, and to judge in it.—As the *Presbytery* could see no great Intricacy in the Affair, to incline them to refer it to the *Synod*, or to call for Assistance in any kind from them ; so they conceived it would have been ridiculous to have made a Reference, without such a Reason, (without which there should be no Reference from an inferior to a superior Judicature;) and that it would have been wicked to have pretended such a Reason, when we were of Opinion we had none such.—Neither did any of the Members of the *Synod* pretend such an Intricacy ; but some of them spoke contemptibly of the Committee's Remarks. The quick Decision of the Affair afterwards by the *Synod*, manifests sufficiently that they found nothing dark or intricate in it.—So this could not be the Reason of the *Synod*'s drawing it to themselves.—Neither can any Sentence of the *Presbytery* of *Glasgow*, shewing Partiality and Prejudice against Mr. *Leechman*, be pretended, as the Reason of the *Synod*'s taking the Cause, in this irregular Way, before them.—For as the *Presbytery* had passed no Sentence against Mr. *Leechman*, only had appointed a Committee to inquire into his Sermon, upon *a fama clamosa* of there being offensive and dangerous Ways of teaching in it ; and this in Obedience to an Act of Assembly ; so they did this, first, for the preservation of Truth, and out of a Regard to that ; and, in the second Place, for the Vindication of our Brother if found innocent, and the reclaiming of him, if found guilty.—Neither doth the Reverend *Synod* pretend this. It is indeed said, as one Ground of their Sentence, that they had considered the Grounds of the Professor's Complaint, and therefore, &c. But they have not ventured to say, that they had found these Grounds either Fact or relevant. Besides, if the Reverend *Synod* had drawn this Cause to their own Cognisance, because they judged the *Presbytery* partial, and prejudiced against the Professor, they would not (I am sure they should not) have allowed the *Presbytery* to sit with them as Judges in this Affair, when

when they did not exclude any Member of the Presbytery from being, that pleased to acquiesce in the Synod's Sentence.—And therefore it could not proceed from the Synod's judging the Presbytery partial, that they gave the Sentence complained of.—It remains then, that it proceeded from an undue Partiality in the Reverend Synod, in favours of Mr. Leechman, and against the Presbytery of Glasgow.

This appeared further in the Speeches of several before the Synod, who cried for Dispatch to vindicate Mr. Leechman's Character, without so much as the least Word for a superior Concern; and which we ought to have in the first Place, tho' not separate from the other, for the preserving Truth, and purity of Doctrine, in our Mother-Church.—These were the two Points the Presbytery considered as inseperable, and which they aimed at in their due Place.—And in this they have been hindered by the Synod, whether justly or unjustly the Venerable Assembly will judge.—How unlike to former General Assemblies have the Synod been, in their Carriage towards the Reverend Presbytery of Glasgow.—The Assembly were so far from taking a Procesis against the late Mr. John Simpson, of great Intricacy and Difficulty, out of the Presbytery's Hands, that, at the earnest Desire of the Presbytery, they appointed a special Committee to meet with the Presbytery, when the Presbytery should think it needful, and call for them.—The Assembly knows very well, that the Reverend Presbytery of Glasgow were to be encouraged to Vigilance and Zeal, and not discouraged and borne down; considering that it hath so fallen out, that the Professors of Divinity in the University of Glasgow, viz. Mr. Cameron, Mr. Strang, Mr. Simpson, have given more Trouble to the Church, with their Ways of teaching, than she hath had from all the other Professors of Divinity in the Church.—And should a Presbytery, that is called immediately to watch over the Purity of Doctrine taught within their Bounds, be so much borne down and discouraged, as the Presbytery of Glasgow hath been by this Sentence of the Synod?

I proceed now to present first the Members of the Venerable Assembly, and then the whole World, with an Account of the Procedure of the *Synod* in an Affair, considering all Circumstances, of the greatest Importance to Truth, and the Mediatory Scheme, so much opposed and disregarded at this Time in *Britain*, a Procedure, to which it will be hard to find a Parallel since the Reformation.

The *Synod* had been adjourned to Seven o'Clock at Night.—It was somewhat after before the *Synod* met.—It was supposed by some who spoke according to Rules of Justice, and the fixed Forms of Procedure in this Church, that the *Synod* would sit any further Procedure in this Affair, and forbear to execute a Sentence the *Presbytery* of *Glasgow* had appealed from, according to the most express Appointment and Decree of the Form of Proces, *Chap. 5. Sect. 10. That the Judicatory appealed from, is to sit until the Appeal be discuss.*

But it had been previously resolved, that no Bars should hinder them from vindicating Professor *Leechman's* Sermon, and declaring themselves satisfied with his Answers:—For in the Forenoon, one of the keenest for Mr. *Leechman* said to another strong Speaker of the same Stamp, and others about him, before the *Synod* met, The *Presbytery* of *Glasgow* will appeal, and then we have done with it. No, said the other, Let us go on notwithstanding: For the Assembly will shew a great Regard to the Judgment of the *Synod* of *Glasgow*.—Strange Presumption! to imagine that the General Assembly, the supreme Ecclesiastical Guardian of Truth and Church-rules and Order, an Assembly consisting of many Members, the most eminent in the Nation for Piety, Justice, Learning and Honour, an Assembly much more superior to the *Synod* of *Glasgow*, than the Reverend *Synod* is to the *Presbytery*; to imagine, that such a Venerable Body would have Regard to the Judgment of a *Synod* acting knowingly, deliberately, and designedly, against one of the most essential Forms of Procedure, appointed by the General Assembly, with the Consent of the whole Church.

to the Judgment of a Synod, which if it were right, could only be so by Accident, and not in the least by Understanding, tho' given by an Oecumenical Synod.—Strange Thought!—What a low Opinion had said Member, and others of the Venerable Assembly of the Church of Scotland? — It may be expected, that the Assembly will resent such a Contempt of their Authority and Judgment, as the *Synod's* proceeding in a Cause, after the Injustice they had already done a Presbytery, none of the least in the Church, made said *Presbytery* appeal and cry to the Assembly for Redress.

The first Thing the *Synod* did, was to call for the Committee of *Presbytery's Remarks*, and the Professor's Answers to them from the Moderator of the *Presbytery of Glasgow*. — He answered, He could not well call his *Presbytery* at the Rising of the *Synod*; but if the *Synod* pleased, he should then call the Members to meet, and lay the Commands of the *Synod* before them. — But this was not insisted upon. — Professor *Leechman* had given them in Copies of all in the Forenoon. — It was found, that the Copy of the Committee's *Remarks* was not signed by the Clerk of the *Presbytery*, — he being found in the *Synod*, acknowledged the Copy given in, to be the Copy he had delivered to Professor *Leechman*, and that he was willing to sign it, when his *Presbytery* should order him. — This was marked upon the Copy by the Moderator of the *Synod*, and the *Synod* resolved to proceed upon it as authentick. — All these Preliminaries took up a considerable Time; — so that it was now about Nine o'Clock at Night, if not beyond it.

Then the *Remarks* of the Committee were read, and Professor *Leechman's* Answers to them: Also some Passages in Professor *Leechman's* Sermon, and the Passages in the *Confession of Faith*, and in our *Larger and Shorter Catechisms* referred to in the said *Remarks*. — The Reader may, *en passant*, judge what Time, about four Sheets of Paper, References to the Sermon, and *Confession of Faith*, &c. and necessary Halts to find out laid Passages, would take to read, let it be done ever so hastily.—

stily.—The *Synod Minutes* saith, they were read distinctly, which the *Presbytery* admits, and which would take a little more Time.—During this Time it was, that a zealous Brother from the West, who spoke frequently in the Cause, and who had declared himself to be no Heresy-hunter, cried out, while a Passage of the *Confession of Faith* was reading, Read the *Confession of Faith*; they answered, They were then reading it: To which he replied, He did not know that. The Reader will reasonably suppose us to be now between Ten and Eleven o'Clock at Night.

It was then agreed, that each of the Committee's *Remarks* should be read over again, and the Professor's *Answers* to them; and that after the reading of every such *Remark* and *Answer*, a Pause should be made, and a due Interval of Time be allowed for any Member that pleased to deliver his Judgment concerning the Professor's *Answers*, to propose any Difficulty that occurred to him, or to require any further Explications; and if the House was intirely silent, it was to be presumed, the Professor's *Answers* had given sufficient Satisfaction.

Several Members declared, that they could not be ripe, by all they could hear at the Time, to give any Judgment, either justifying or condemning the Professor.—Others declared, That their Silence should not be construed a Satisfaction, with the Professor's *Answers*. One Minister told the Moderator, That he came not there to sit as a Judge, but only to gratify his Curiosity as a Spectator and Hearer.—Two Reverend Ministers again and again insisted, That there should be a Vote of the *Synod*, upon their agreeing to proceed in this Affair; but they were not heard.—Two or Three made some Exceptions once or twice, but were not well treated by some Members; and few thought it worth While to say any Thing, when they saw the Haste of the Procedure.

After the *Synod* had made some Procedure, the Reverend Mr. *MacCulloch*, Minister of the Gospel at *Cambuslang*, observing, as he expresseth himself in the *Reasons of Appeal* he took from the *Synod's* Procedure, an Affair of

of such vast Importance, carried on that Sederunt with such strange Precipitation, that there was oftentimes not one Minute's Space of a Stop or Interval allowed between the reading of one *Remark* and *Answer* and another, for Members to object any Thing: He the said Mr. *MacCulloch* protested against the laid Procedure of the *Synod*, and appealed to the Venerable Assembly.—This would also require some Time.

The Members of the General Assembly will judge, with how great Hurry the Reverend *Synod* went through this Affair; it was between Ten and Eleven before the *Synod* went upon judging, whether Professor *Leechman's* *Answers* were satisfying, or not. The *Synod's* Minutes say, The Committee's *Remarks*, and the Professor's *Answers*, were read distinctly; there were some Interruptions in the various Declarations already mentioned; there could not but be some considerable Space of Time, in the Reverend Mr. *MacCulloch's* making his *Protestation* and *Appeal*: There was a considerable Time in making the *Synod's* Sentence, and in reporting it to Mr. *Leechman*, and his Speech upon it; and last of all, in proposing and concering a Communing that Night between the *Presbytery of Glasgow* and Mr. *Leechman*: Now, let the Brethren, keenest in Mr. *Leechman's* Cause, declare, what Time remained for Halts and due Intervals, and for Deliberation, when the *Synod* was adjourned before Twelve at Night.—It will be found, that three Quarters of an Hour, or little more, was spent upon a Cause, that, by the *Synod's* Minutes, consisted of Nine Articles, all of them Doctrinal, and some of them of considerable Intricacy, as all of them were of the greatest Importance.

What, I thought, was of all the most singular and observable, was, that, during the whole Procedure, not one offered to explain or demonstrate, how Mr. *Leechman's* *Answers* were satisfying to the *Remarks* of the Committee, or spoke so much as the least Word, from Beginning to End, how they were so.—There was not, as far as I could observe, above half a Dozen of Copies of the Sermon in the *Synod*,—which Mr. *Leechman* distributed to those about the

Table;

Table;—such was the Judgment that was passed in this important Affair.—And it were to be wished, that Members of the *Synod*, of all Sorts, may remember, that the GOD of Truth was looking upon them, and may enquire at their own conscious Minds, How far they understood what they judged of, and could then give Reasons, why they were satisfied with Mr. Leechman's *Answers*? — And whether severals of them were not resolved to be satisfied, before hearing the Cause?

In the Issue, and upon the Whole, the *Synod* considering Professor Leechman's *Answers*, found them fully satisfying to the *Remarks* or *Objections* offered by the Committee of the Presbytery of Glasgow; and found, that he has therein removed any Offence, the Committee seemed to have conceived in the said *Remarks*, made by them; (*Who told them that?* — The Committee never said, the Offence was removed from them; — and, to this Day, it remains with others as it did) and therefore, the *Synod* finds no Reason to charge the said Professor with any Unsoundness in the Faith, expressed in these Passages complained of in that Sermon. — The Sentence was intimated to Professor Leechman, whereupon he took Instruments in the Clerk's Hands, expressing, at the same Time, (as the *Synod's* Minutes say) the warmest Sentiments of Gratitude to the Reverend, Honourable, and worthy Members of the *Synod*, for the TIME and PAINS they had bestowed in doing Justice to his Character; and hoping, that through Divine Assistance, in the future Exercize of his Office, he should justify the favourable Opinion they seemed to conceive of him. — How far Mr. Leechman owed them Thanks for the Manner of their Procedure, which, I am afraid, won't be greatly convincing, I leave it to impartial Judges now, and to the whole of the following Generation to judge.

It was moved by an Honourable Member of the *Synod*, That Mr. Leechman should have an amicable private Conference with the Presbytery of Glasgow, who had appeared dissatisfied with the Conduct of the *Synod* in this Affair.—It was readily agreed to, with a Declaration of Readi-

Readiness, to comply with every proper Motion that should tend to remove Differences.—Mr. Robe proposed, that the Conference should be in the Presence of two or three Members of the *Synod*, whom he should name, if the *Synod* would please to indulge it.—This being allowed, Mr. Robe named two Members, that appeared to be keenest upon Mr. Leechman's Vindication, namely, the Reverend Mr. John Orr, and the Honourable Mr. Patrick Boyle, with the Moderator of the *Synod*:—This he did, that they might be Witnesses, how ready the *Presbytery* of *Glasgow* would be to accept of any Satisfaction that might tend to continue the Truth of the Gospel with us and Posterity.—The *Synod* appointed accordingly.

After the Rising of the *Synod*, the *Presbytery* of *Glasgow* met with Professor Leechman, in the Presence of the Committee of *Synod*, where there was a most amicable and friendly Communing.—Mr. Robe proposed, as Preliminaries, that whatever should be said, either by Mr. Leechman, or any Member of *Presbytery*, should never be brought in Judgment against either, by the other Party;—and that, if any Agreement should be, it should not be finally concluded, until these Brethren in the *Presbytery*, concerned in the Appeal, and who were absent, should be acquainted with it, and satisfied also.

It had been proposed, before the Rising of the *Synod*, by some Members, to Mr. Leechman, that he should publish a third Edition of his Sermon, and prefix a *Preface* to it, wherein he should declare, that the Sermon was designed for the Conviction of Deists, and to reason with them, and convince them from their own Principles. This seemed to be, what could not miss to be satisfying to the World, in the Opinion of many Members of the *Synod*;—And I am persuaded, Mr. Leechman's cool Answer, That there were many Copies of the second Edition upon the Printer's Hands, which must be disposed of, before a third Edition could be published, gave them Hopes, that

the Proposal would be complied with, and that all Mankind would be satisfied with such a Declaration.

In the Entrance of the Communing between the Presbytery of Glasgow and Mr. Leechman, it was declared, upon the Part of the Presbytery, that such a Declaration could not satisfy the Presbytery, and could never satisfy any who knew the Controversy between Christians and the Deists: For these three Reasons,

First, The Persons to whom the Sermon is directed, and who are introduced as immediately concerned in it, are expressly said to be the *Followers of Jesus, such as call themselves his Disciples, and Professors of Christianity*, p. 1. And in the Example of Prayer, in the End of the Sermon, they are such as believe some of the peculiar Doctrines of Christianity, concerning the Lord Jesus Christ, p. 62 and 63. these are the Persons concerned in the Sermon; and these Characters differing vastly from that of the Deists; such a Declaration then would be evidently false, and be *protestatio contra factum*. — To this, all the Answer, I remember, was given, was, That he might possibly say Things that were inconsistent.

The second Reason, why such a Declaration could not satisfy, was, That the Deists owned Prayer to be a Duty, and Part of Natural Religion, as much as Christians, and that we knew no Set of Deists who denied Prayer to be a Duty, and that we had no Controversy with them upon this Score: And he was desired to instance any Set of them who denied it, and upon whose Principles he had endeavoured to prove the Reasonableness of Prayer; and therefore, it could never be designed, or useful to the Deists, and consequently, a Declaration of this Kind could never satisfy. — He instanced the Pamphlet of one Mr. Cuming a Quaker, who published a Pamphlet at Glasgow, entitled, *A rational Inquiry concerning Prayer*. — To this it was replied, That *Cuming* pretends to prove in that Pamphlet, the Insufficiency of human Reason, to prove that Mankind ought to invoke, or thank their Creator; and hence the Necessity of Revelation, and the Argument

gument he offers to the Consideration of the Modern Deists.— So that *Cuming*, howsoever bad his Argument is, acts in Opposition unto the Deists.— It was also further urged, that Mr. *Leechman* had answered not above two of *Cuming's Objections*, and that the *Presbytery* had quarrelled no part of his Sermon, wherein he answers these Objections of *Cuming*.— To this he only said, that he had not answered all *Cuming's Objections*.

The third Reason why it could never satisfy to declare it was designed for the *Deists*, was, Truth is unchangeable, and therefore if it was a bad Sermon, and offensive if designed for Christians; it could never become a true and good Sermon considered as directed to *Deists*. I do not remember what Answer was given to this; or if any was.

Now because the most general Defence, advanced in Conversation, seems to be, that this Sermon was intended against *Deists*, or that the real Scope of it, is not to describe Christian Prayer; but either Prayer incumbent upon *Deists*, and practicable by them while continuing such; or Prayer in general: I shall take occasion here from this Part of our Communing related, at some greater Length to shew the Weakness and Insufficiency of this Defence, so ordinarily made by the Friends of Mr. *Leechman*, as also by himself in his Answers.

In General it is observable, as far as I have conversed with these who make this Defence, that when it is canvassed a little, in order to see how it may be applied for answering Objections; they who advance it, seem not to have clear and determinate Notions of what they intend by it, or to have directly considered where the Stress of the Objections lies.— I never could as yet find the Person who could point out to me, what Principles of the *Deists* or *Scepticks* the Author reasons from, to convince them of any peculiar Doctrines or Duties of Christianity, they don't receive or admit of; for this is the precise Point in Question, that the Apologists must Answer. And it is what they shall never be able to do. Which is suffici-

ent if there were no more to repell the Defence so much made.

But further to shew its Insufficiency, let us suppose for once, that the Scope of the first Part, or Head of the Sermon, to which the first five Remarks of the Committee relate, is to describe and explain the Prayer the *Deists* and *Scepticks*, while such, may and ought to use : In this Case it will indeed found an Alteration of the Charge against the Sermon, but then it must be from that of dangerous omissions, to something of a more positive, and at the same Time of a more dangerous Nature. Namely, His asserting in the third Act of Prayer, that the Person using this deistical Prayer, should have an assured Hope of Hearing and Acceptance.

2dly, On the Supposition made, that it is the Prayer of *Deists* the Author is explaining, is it not exceeding exceptionable, that when on the second Act, where he speaks of the Blessings they should pray for, there is no insertion of the Petition, which it might be thought, a Teacher of the Gospel would inculcate as most necessary for a Disbeliever of it ? viz. *That God would graciously direct him to a right Judgment and Determination about it.*

3dly, If it is mere deistical Prayer, that is the real Scope of this Explication, is it not dangerous, highly dangerous, that it is not the declared and professed Scope of it, and that it is not declared expressly in the Discourse, in entring upon the Explication of Prayer ? — When a Christian Minister professeth to explain to a Christian Audience *the Nature of Prayer, and to set it in its true Light*, &c. It can never signify to explain *Unchristian Deistical Prayer*. — Is there any Thing more natural for an Audience, when their Teacher proposes to explain Prayer, &c. than to suppose he means to explain the Prayer *incumbent on them* ? — To say that the Author's real Scope was to explain a sort of Prayer, that labours under an essential Defect, is to say, that he was under the greatest Obligations in the most explicite manner to give his Audience due Warning and Intimation

mation of it : Warning them, that tho' what he was to explain, was all that was practicable by unhappy Unbelievers while such, they who were Christians should beware of such dangerous Defects, as they would not incur such awful Threatnings as *John iii. 36. He that believeth not upon the Son, shall not see Life, but the wrath of God abideth on him.*—This third Head of reasoning is stronger, when it is remembred what Mr. Leechman declared publickly before the *Synod*, that this Sermon was first preached at *Beith*, in about a Month afterwards a second Time at *Edinburgh*, and in eight Days after that for a third Time at *Glasgow*.—Were not these Christian Audiences well entertained, in hearing an Explication of Deistical Prayer, without the least warning that it was not designed for them, and that the explained Prayer would be the greatest Abomination unto the Lord coming from them ? Supposing then the Defence mentioned to be real, it is in so far from making the Case complained of better, that it makes it worse

If it is said, *That the Author's Design is to explain Christian Prayer, and the Scope of the Explication is the Instruction and Information of Deists, &c. that by setting Christian Prayer in its true Light, the Author may recommend and vindicate it to them.*—To this it is sufficient to Anwer, First, that it is Prayer with these Peculiarities of Christianity that are essential to acceptable Prayer, the *Deists*, whither confirmed or sceptical quarrel, and not Prayer it self, as hath been observed already.—*2do.* In this View the Committee's first four Remarks fall heavy upon the Explication, as guilty of such Omissions as render Prayer thus described, far from being Christian, and tending more to make Christians *Deists*, than *Deists* Christians.

It is of Use to observe that when it is said, (as it is sometimes) *That the Author's Scope is not to explain Christian or Deistical Prayer; but Prayer in general:*—

This

This must naturally signify these general *Things* in Prayer that are *Common* to both these Sorts of it: — And it is obvious, that when a Man's Prayer has nothing in it but what is common to *Deists* (whether confirmed or sceptical Ones) it is but mere Deistical Prayer still, or merely the Prayer of natural Religion, under all the Disadvantages of our Apostacy and universal natural Depravation.

From all this it is glaringly evident, that the Committee's Charge against the Sermon is neither taken off or lessened by this general Defence, either of the Author of the Sermon or his Friends. — And the thinking World, whether Christians or *Deists*, can never be satisfied by such a Declaration, but see the Weakness of any who would, if it were prefixed in a Preface to the Sermon a thousand Times.

This Digression occasioned by the first Part of the above-mentioned Communing, and so needful to clear up the Truth in this Affair, will shorten After-remarks upon the Professor's Answers to the Committee's Remarks. — And now I return to the Communing between the Reverend *Presbytery* of Glasgow and Professor Leechman.

It was proposed upon the *Presbytery*'s Part, that Mr. Leechman should publish a third Edition of his Sermon, and prefix a Preface to it, wherein he should expressly disown the dangerous ways of teaching charged upon the Sermon, the erroneous Propositions the Committee apprehended to be contained in it: And in express Terms confess the contrary Truths. — With this, if it were done before the Assembly, the *Presbytery* would be satisfied, and would in all Probability drop their Appeal.

To this Proposal it was answered by the Professor, *First*, That he could not have Time to draw up such a Preface before the Meeting of the Assembly, because he purposed to employ himself in much teaching until that Time. — *2d^o*, That the Printer and Publisher had many Copies of the second Edition, and if there were a

third

third, before these were disposed of, they would lie upon the Publisher's Hand. — 3dly, He said, he would act openly and sincerely, that he could not do it lest the World should misinterpret his so doing, as acting for low, mean and worldly Ends.

It was then proposed upon the *Presbytery's* Part, that Mr. *Leechman* might draw up such a Preface to the Satisfaction of the *Presbytery*, and which a few Pages might contain, and a few Hours serve for framing it, and give it into the Hands of the *Presbytery*, before the Meeting of the Assembly, giving his Word to publish it as soon as could be conveniently, and if he should not, the *Presbytery* might be warranted to do it. — This was what he declared he could not do. — With this the Communing ended.

The Time we continued together, was spent in most friendly and amicable Converse. — I promised to visit Mr. *Leechman*, when I came to the Town, *D. V.* upon the 17th of *April*, to which Time our *Presbytery* was adjourned.

In a *Presbytery* called the Week after, the *Synod* to authorise the Reasons of our Appeal from the Sentence of the *Synod*, it was resolved to sift all further Procedure in this Affair, and to vacate our Meeting appointed to Judge of Professor *Leechman's* Answers, until the Venerable Assembly should decide in our Appeal. — We were abundantly sensible, that we could have legally proceeded, to judge in this Affair, according to our former Adjournment and Appointment; — and which the Reverend *Synod* had done Illegally. — Yet, out of a regard to the Authority of the Venerable Assembly, from whom we do not despair of at least such Redress, as will have a Tendency to prevent for the Time to come these dangerous Omissions, and dangerous ways of teaching. — such as omitting the necessary Regard due to the true Mediatory-Scheme, in handling Subjects of which such Regards are *essential* and *necessary Parts*, which ways of preaching are much encreasing in this Church. —

Of

Of this Method of preaching this Sermon; is an eminent Instance.—I say, out of Regard to the Venerable Assembly, as also to our Brethren in the *Synod*, we forbear to proceed further, untill we should have the Assembly's Judgment, which our Brethren have so much disregarded.

I have been the more particular in this Historical Relation, that the venerable Assembly, and all the World may see, that Obstinacy is no Cause of the Reverend *Presbytery's* Method of Procedure in this *Cause*; but that we have the strongest Reasons, determining us to prosecute this Affair to the utmost resort.—Which we pray and hope may be happy and good.



REMARKS

[41]

REMARKS OF A COMMITTEE of the Presbytery of Glasgow, Upon Professor LEECHMAN's *Sermon upon Prayer.*

1. THE Author presents God to Christians, as the Object of their religious Worship, and particularly, Prayer; merely and absolutely as our Creator, without relation to Jesus Christ, which the Committee conceives to be inconsistent with the *Confession of Faith, Chap. 21. Sect. 2.* "Religious Worship is to be given to God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and to him alone; not to Angels, Saints, or any other Creature: And since the Fall, not without a Mediator; nor in the Mediation of any other, but of Christ alone." And *Shorter Catechism's Answer to the Question, What doth the Preface to the Ten Commandments teach us?* "The Preface to the Ten Commandments teacheth us, That because God is the Lord, and our God, and Redeemer, therefore we are bound to keep all his Commandments."

2. In his Discourse upon the Nature of Prayer, in which he proposes to set it in its true Light, by stripping it of every Thing foreign and superfluous, and which stands in his Book as a finished Piece; there is no Mention made of

the Merit and Intercession of our blessed Saviour and Redeemer, which we think is expressly contrary to *Act 7.*
Aff. 1736. the chief Design of which is, to excite Ministers and Preachers to guard against the great Prejudice that our Religion must sustain, not only by opposing, but also by neglecting and disregarding, or too superficially handling of the blessed Truths of the Gospel, concerning Christ and his Mediation, &c. It seems also not to come up to the Description of Prayer, given in our *Larger* and *Shorter Catechisms*, which take in the Name of Jesus Christ as an essential Ingredient.

3. That the Author of the Sermon having described Prayer, as mentioned in the former Proposition, he again and again asserts, That the Person thus praying shall be heard and accepted of God; which we conceive to be contrary to the *Confession*, *Chap. 21. Sect. 3.* "Prayer, " with Thanksgiving, being one special Part of religious "Worship, is by God required of all Men; and that it "may be accepted, it is to be made in the Name of the "Son, by the Help of his Spirit, according to his Will, " &c." As also to *Larger Catechism's Answer to Question, What is it to pray in the Name of Christ?* "To "pray in the Name of Christ, is in Obedience to his "Command, and in Confidence on his Promises, to ask "Mercy for his Sake, not by bare mentioning of his "Name, but by drawing our Encouragement to pray, "and our Boldness, Strength, and Hope of Acceptance "in Prayer from Christ and his Mediation." And likewise to answer to *Question, Why are we to pray in the Name of Christ?* "The Sinfulness of Man, and his Distance from God by reason thereof, being so great, as "that we can have no Access into his Presence without a "Mediator; and there being none in Heaven or Earth "appointed to, or fit for that glorious Work, but Christ "alone, we are to pray in no other Name but his only."
4. The Author teaches a Trust and Confidence in God, encouraged from the Consideration of his infinite Mercy, p. 7, 8, and 59. And the Manifestations, he, as Creator, has given Mankind of his glorious Perfections, as employed

ed for their Safety and Welfare, p. 12. Line 10th, from the Foot, without any Relation to the Mediation of Jesus Christ, and the Covenant of Promises founded on him. Contrary, as we conceive, to *Larger Catechism's Answer to the Question, What is justifying Faith?* "Where " Faith and Trust include, not only Assent to the Truths " of the Gospel-promise, but a receiving, and resting up- " on Christ and his Righteousness therein held forth." As also, to *Confession, Chap. 14. Sect. 2.* "Where the " principal Acts of Faith are, accepting, receiving, and " resting upon Christ alone, for Justification, Sanctifica- " tion, and eternal Life, by Virtue of the Covenant of " Grace."

5. The Author seems to them to insinuate, that there are some of Mankind, who, without the Benefit of Revelation, are capable to reason out to themselves such a Knowledge of God, as may be sufficient to their attaining to eternal Happiness; which Proposition is contrary to *Confession, Chap. 1. Sect. 1.* "Altho' the Light of Nature, and the Works of Creation and Providence, do so far manifest the Goodness, Wisdom and Power of God, as to leave Men unexcusable; yet are they not sufficient to give that Knowledge of God, and of his Will, which is necessary unto Salvation; therefore it pleased the Lord, at sundry Times, and in diverse Manners, to reveal himself, and to declare that his Will unto his Church; and afterwards, for the better preserving and propagating the Truth, for the more sure Establishment and Comfort of the Church, against the Corruption of the Flesh, and the Malice of Satan and of the World, to commit the same wholly unto Writing: Which maketh the Holy Scripture to be most necessary; those former Ways of God's revealing his Will unto his People being now ceased :" As also, to *Larger Catechism*, in Answer to Question, *How does it appear that there is a God?* "The very Light of Nature in Man, and the Works of God, declare that there is a God; but his Word and Spirit only, do sufficiently " and

" and effectually reveal him unto Men, for their Salva-
" tion"

6. The Committee finds, That in the Objection, as it is laid, p. 36. it is directly asserted, " That Punishments threatened to be inflicted on Sinners, in this and an eternal World, are intended by our kind Creator, for our Reformation and Amendment." And in the Answer to this Objection, this Proposition, tho' false in itself, and dangerous in its Consequences, is not disowned or disclaimed; tho' such a Way of speaking and teaching, is also contrary to our Standards. *Vide Confession, Chap. 3. Sect. 7.* "The rest of Mankind, God was pleased, according to the unsearchable Counsel of his own Will, whereby he extendeth, or with-holdeth Mercy as he pleaseth, for the Glory of his sovereign Power over his Creatures, to pass by, and to ordain them to Dishonour and Wrath for their Sin, to the Praise of his glorious Justice: And *Chap. 6. Sect. 6.* " Every Sin, both original and actual, being a Transgression of the righteous Law of God, and contrary thereunto, doth, in its own Nature, bring Guilt upon the Sinner, whereby he is bound over to the Wrath of God, and Curse of the Law, and so made subject to Death, with all Miseries spiritual, temporal and eternal."

7. Further, the Author seems to assert, p. 36. and 37. That there is a natural, and therefore a necessary Connection betwixt a penitent Disposition, and the Pardon of our Sins; thereby superseding the Necessity of the Satisfaction of Christ and the Constitution of God; which is contrary to our Standards, *viz. Confession, Chap. 15. Sect. 3.* " Altho' Repentance be not to be rested in, as any Satisfaction for Sin, or any Cause of the Pardon thereof, which is the Act of God's free Grace in Christ; yet is of such Necessity to all Sinners, that none may expect Pardon without it. And *Chap. 11. Sect. 1.* " Those whom God effectually calleth, he also freely justifieth: Not by infusing Righteousness into them, but by pardoning their Sins, and by accounting and accepting their Persons as righteous, not for any Thing wrought in them,

" them, or done by them, but for Christ's Sake alone ;
 " nor by imputing Faith itself, the Act of Believing, or
 " any other Evangelical Obedience to them, as their
 " Righteousness ; but by imputing the Obedience and
 " Satisfaction of Christ unto them, they receiving and
 " resting on him, and his Righteouiness by Faith ; which
 " Faith they have not of themselves, it is the Gift of God.
 And *Larger Catechism's Answer to, What doth every Sin deserve at the Hand of God?* " Every Sin, even
 " the least, being against the Sovereignty, Goodness and
 " Holiness of God, against his righteous Law, deserveth
 " his Wrath and Curse, both in this Life and that which
 " is to come ; and cannot be expiated, but by the Blood
 " of Christ."

8. The Committee observes, that the Passage cited, p. 4.
 at the Beginning, appears to be altered.

9. The Committee observes from p. 62, from the Middle,
 That where the Author mentions the various Ends of the
 coming of Christ into the World, he omits taking Notice
 of the greatest and most important End, namely, his Sa-
 tisfaction.

To this I shall immediately subjoin an *Abstract* of some
 of the Reasonings used, to shew how the foregoing *Re-
 marks* are founded upon the *Sermon*, and their *Contents*
 are contrary to our Standards.

OBSERVATIONS in order to shew
more clearly how some Remarks, of prin-
cipal Importance, above-mentioned, are con-
tained in the SERMON, and contrary to
our Standards.

AS to the 1st and 4th Propositions, which are to be considered in their Connection, the Author's Ways of Teaching, on these Heads, appear the more unsafe and exceptionable, for the following five Reasons : 1. The Sinner who is directed to seek and hope for Salvation, without being directed to seek and hope for it through Christ, is described as having that Conviction of Sin and Danger, which, according to our Standards (See *Larg. Cat. Ans. to Quest. 72.*) is the Means of making a Sinner see his Need of Christ.

2. The Expressions and Phrases commonly applied by sound Divines, agreeably to Scripture, to the Actings of true Faith in Christ, are, by this Author, applied to a Faith that has no Regard to him ; such as, " Taking " Refuge, and the Soul's throwing itself, and all its great " Interests, with unbounded Confidence, &c." p. 7. l. 11. and p. 59. l. 29.

3. The Words by which the Faith and Confidence, described without Regard to Christ, are expressed, are so strong, as to imply the Soul's exercising the very highest and firmest Acts of Hope and Confidence in God for Salvation, without Regard to the true Foundation : Such as p. 7. l. ult. *Affured Trust*, p. 8. l. 8. *Confidence*, p. 59. l. 29. *boundless Confidence*.

4. Not only in one Place or two, but in many Places, the Author presents God to Christians as the Object of Religious Worship, particularly of Prayer, and of Trust and Confidence, merely and absolutely as Creator or Preserver, without Relation to Jesus Christ ; as p. 7. l. 11, 12, 15, 28. p. 8. l. 8. p. 12. l. 21. p. 59. l. 26. These Ways

Ways of Teaching appear contrary not only to those Passages in our Standards already marked out by the Committee; but also to Confess. Chap. 7. Sect. 6. where holding forth the Covenant of Grace, and Christ the Substance of it, with more Fulness and Evidence than was done under the Old Testament, is represented as the essential Character of the Ordinances of the New Testament. This Character is therefore not only disregarded but over-turned; when such necessary holding forth thereof is neglected, in handling Subjects of which these Things are necessary, principal Parts, and with which they have the most immediate, necessary Connection: Which is evidently the Case as to the Subjects mentioned, such as, Prayer, and Trust and Confidence in God for Salvation; however this may be called, by some, a mere Omission only.

5. Besides the above dangerous Way of over-looking the true Gospel Foundation of Hope, some Passages seem naturally to imply a positive Substitution of another Foundation in its Room, and to teach, that Christians, tho' they enjoy the Benefit of Revelation, may build their utmost Confidence on Grounds discoverable by the mere Light of Nature (such as the Perfection of Providence) and may even pray to God to engage them to do so.—For. p. 59. l. 25. one who believes the Gospel Revelation is represented as praying, that he may be engaged to throw himself, and all his great Interests, (consequently his eternal Salvation) on universal Providence, as perfect in Wisdom and Goodness, and that with unbounded Confidence.—This Passage, in its only and natural Meaning, is contrary to the first Sentence in our Confession, about the Insufficiency of the Works of Providence to shew the Way of Salvation; and also contrary to the above-cited Parts of our Standards, about Justifying Faith, as necessarily including a Resting on Christ for Salvation; for the Position substitutes the general Perfections of Providence, and Faith or Persuasion thereof, (which is but a Principle of mere Natural Religion) in the Room of the perfect Merits of Christ, and Faith in him. In

In like Manner, there is a Substitution of another Rule of God's Government, founding the Sinner's Hope of Salvation, in the Room of the Covenant of Grace, p. 8. and p. 9. l. 10, 20, 30. — That Context seems to teach, that this is a sufficient Foundation of such Hope, where Men can reason out the Deity's just Character, so as to infer, that there is a standing Law of his Government, that always was, is, and will be, connecting Felicity with Virtue, particularly, with sincere Prayer, without Regard to a Mediator.— For the Scope of that Context is partly to shew the Necessity of Confidence, or Hope of Salvation, or of the Acceptance of Prayer for it; partly to shew the Usefulness of revealed Promises for that End: The Ground of *which Usefulness* is said to be, that Numbers could not reason out the Deity's just Character, as thence to infer the Connection.— This seems naturally to imply both, that Numbers of others did or may reason out that Connection, according to the Commitree's 5th Remark; and that, when thus discovered, it is a sufficient Ground for that Confidence, and so a sufficient Direction to Salvation, and to such an assured Hope of it as the Author had mentioned before, p. 7. l. 33.

What is thus substitute instead of the Covenant of Grace appears, in different Respects, inconsistent with the true Doctrine of it; which implies, *imo*, That it is a new Covenant, presupposing Man's Fall, *Confess.* Chap. 7. Sect. 3. and so different from the Law, which the Author speaks of, as having *always been*, and which must therefore be *as old as the Creation*.— *2do*, That tho', in this Covenant, there is a Connection between Sanctification and Life eternal; yet the Blessings thus connected (and all others) are promised by God, and to be sought and hoped for by us, for the Sake of the Redeemer, and thro' Faith in him, *Confess.* Chap. 7. Sect. 3.— Therefore it must be an unsafe Way of Teaching, when the Regards due to Christ are neglected, and the Connection above, abstracted from these Regards, is considered as an *invariable divine Law*, that has always subsisted, and is still a sufficient Foundation for the Sinner's Hope of Happi-

Happiness and Salvation, this makes one and the same invariable Law, equally the Foundation of Hope of Happiness to Innocents and fallen Men.—It tends to confound the two Covenants, which it is of the greatest Consequence to distinguish.—And also it tends to make Sinners seek Justification by the Law, which tho' it always did and will stand; yet a chief Use of it to Transgressors is to convince them, that they cannot be justified by it, but thro' the Redeemer only. See *Larger Catechism*, Answer to Question from 94th to 97th.

It is to be observed, concerning the Things excepted against, in Sermon, *Page*, 36, and 37. that they should be considered as having great Affinity with other things above mentioned, particularly the Connection between a Sinner's Virtue, which is Reformation, and his Happiness which implies Pardon, as founded upon an invariable Law, which always was, is, and will be; for whatever may be alledged concerning the Connection between the perfect Virtue and Happiness of Creatures who have never sinned, as founded upon this invariable Law, can have no Place in the Connection between the imperfect Virtue attainable by fallen Men, in a State of Tryal, and their Salvation. Other Observes relative to the two Remarks of the Committee upon these Pages are reserved to the Consideration of Mr. Leechman's Answers.

The Committee's Remark upon Sermon *Page* 62. *viz.* That where the Author mentions the various Ends of the Coming of Christ into the World, and of his Death, he omitteth and taketh no Notice of the greatest and most important End, *viz.* His *Satisfaction*, notwithstanding of his insisting on other Ends at such Length, and so particularly: And all this, in speaking of the Ends of Christ's Mission and Death, as Manifestations of his Friendship or Love to us, and Motives of ours to him, is further strengthned by the following Considerations.—It is left to the Consideration and Decision of the Venerable Assembly, whether this Omission, especially as connected with the other Grounds of Exception, injurious to the same Doctrine of Christ's Satisfaction, doth not render

render the good Clauses about Christ as Mediator and Saviour, *Page 62, and 63.* too unsatisfying and ambiguous, to remove the Offence, or hinder the bad Tendency of the other Things remarked on in this Sermon? — For tho' such general Assertions about our approaching to God, or being reinstated in his Favour by Christ, are not ambiguous in Writing, when they are explained on *necessary Occasions* by Christ's Redemption or Satisfaction; yet the Case seems to be different as to Writings, where *general Assertions* of Christ's having *some Influence* on our Salvation, are only explained by such Things as the Influence of his Doctrine, Precepts, Example, and his Death, as confirming his Doctrine: And whereas it was remarked above, Acknowledgment of Christ's Satisfaction is left out *as if it were unnecessary*, in handling Subjects of which, according to Scripture, it is a most necessary Part.

— Of this Kind are these Subjects above-mentioned, *viz.* Acceptable Prayer, — Hope of Acceptance, — The Sinner's Duty, when convinced of Guilt, Danger, Wretchedness and Insufficiency, and flying out of himself to take Refuge in God: Confidence in God's Mercy, his Perfections in general, and his Promises: — The Connection between the Virtues of those whom the Author *Page 9. l. 29.* justly calls apostate, guilty Creatures, and their Happiness in general, when on such Subjects as above-specified, acknowledging only what the Deniers of Christ's Satisfaction acknowledge, and omitting what they omit. Also with such Omissions of Christ's Satisfaction, when on Subjects, of which Regard thereto is a principal Part; joining Ways of Teaching leading to other Foundations of the Sinner's Hope, in its Room; — and leaving it undefended, when answering Objections founded on Principles that are subversive of it.

I shall conclude this Paper of Observations with this Remark, confirming the Committee's second and third Remarks, that as, in the Explication of the Beginning of the Sermon, Prayer in Christ's Name is not taught; so, in the Example at the End of it, Prayer in his Name is not practised: Tho' the praying Person is represented in both

both, as under such Impressions of Sin, as shews the greatest Need of such Prayer. *viz.* In the Explication Page 7. as having a just Sense of Guilt, Danger and Wretchedness; and in the Example Page 61 l. 24. as self-condemned, for many things feeling the Peace of his Mind sensibly disturbed, his Confidence in God greatly damped, and the awful Sense of God's Displeasure strongly awakened in him.

P A R T Third.

I Proceed now, *thirdly*, to shew how far Professor Leechman's Answers to the Committee's Remarks are from being satisfying, and from removing the Offence taken at his Sermon, the Grounds of which Offence are expressed in the Committee's Remarks. — This I shall do by some very short Observes, subjoined to each Head of his Answers.

1st. The Author presents God to Christians, as the Object of their Religious Worship, and particularly Prayer, merely and absolutely as our Creator, without Relation to Jesus Christ, which the Committee conceives to be inconsistent with *Confession of Faith, Chap. 21 Sect. 2.* and to the *Shorter Catechism*, Answer to the Question, *What doth the Preface to the Ten Commands teach us?*

Answer, The Author is not giving Directions concerning the acceptable Way of worshipping God, nor laying down any speculative Principles concerning the proper Object of Religious Worship, or the Grounds of Confidence in God, in the Passages of the Sermon referred to, in the Remark of the Committee: All that the Author asserts is a plain, and, he thinks, an undeniable Fact, that when a Person is struck with a deep Sense, and intimate Conviction, of his own Ignorance, his own Depravity, and his utter Inability to help himself, or secure his own Happiness in this, or in another World, he will then necessarily fly out of himself, and seek Refuge in

Him that made him, and upholds him in Being. This is a Fact abundantly confirmed from Observations on the World, from the natural Workings of the human Mind, and from the Experience of Mankind: This is true, not only of a Jew or a Christian, who has just Notions of the Divine Nature, and Perfections; but it is true also of a Heathen, however imperfect his Notions of God may be. For, whether he believes there is one supreme Being, or believes there are superior Beings, who can help him, he will fly to him or them, in the helpless Circumstances in which I have represented him as placed. This Passage in the Sermon is therefore only a general Observation on human Nature, and true in some Respect in all Nations and Ages of the World, however different their Notions of Religion may be.

Now this is perfectly consistent with the Doctrine of the *Confession of Faith*, that the Propitiation and Intercession of Jesus Christ can only give full Consolation, and perfect Rest, to the Soul of Man, under its greatest Distresses. If the Reverend Committee will be pleased to attend to what I have said, as it stands in Connection with what goes before, they will soon see that the Passages referred to in our Standards contain nothing contrary to what I have said: And that, in order to shew that there is any Inconsistency in my Doctrine, with the *Confession of Faith*, they must find out some Passages of it which asserts, That the deepest Sense of Self-ignorance, Weakness, and Insufficiency for Happiness, will have no Influence to make a rational Creature look beyond itself, and wish and seek for Happiness elsewhere: Besides, it may be answered, that tho' I had given a Direction to Mankind in these Terms, to fly out of themselves, and take Refuge in him who made them, there could be nothing Blame-worthy in this, since it is the known and acknowledged Stile of the holy Scriptures, *Psal. xlvi. 1. 1 Peter iv. 19.*

The Committee of Presbytery, after very long Reasoning, found the Professor's Answer to their first Remark not satisfying, upon such Reasons as these:

1mo, That the Professor mistakes the Passages upon which

which the Committee found their first Remark ; the Passage referred to by him is to be found *Page 7. Line 8.* *9, 10, 11,* and *Line 24, 25, 26, 27, 28.* but they found it upon *Page 5.* *Page 8.* and upon the whole Sermon throughout, where he presents God as the Object of Religious Worship and Prayer, under no other Consideration than merely as Creator, and without Relation to Jesus Christ.—And tho', in the Passages the Professor refers to, he teacheth what he conceives every one of Mankind, who being placed in the helpless Circumstances mentioned, *will necessarily fly out of himself, and take Refuge in him that made him, and upholds him in Being;* —yet he also teaches, and it is the professed Scope of the whole Discourse to teach, not what Mankind, placed in such Circumstances, will do, but what they ought and should do ; namely, what Sort of Prayer should be made by them to God,—as is plain from *Page 4* at the Foot, and *Page 5.* at the Head ; — *In order to understand the Nature of Prayer, let us take Notice, that the inward Acts of Mind and Heart exerted in it, from which the outward Expressions **SHOULD** flow, and by which they **SHOULD** be animated, are principally these three.*—Now in this the Force of the Objection lieth, that Professor Leechman, in teaching what Prayer should be offered unto God, and in his doing this speaks so often of the glorious Object, presents him to Christians as the Object of this Religious Worship ; he saith they should give unto him, merely and absolutely as our Creator, without Relation to Jesus Christ.—So that the Committee looked upon the Answer as an Evasion, and not meeting with the Objection in their first Remark.

His after Reasoning about the Consistency of what he hath said on the Passage referred to with the *Confession of Faith*, is therefore altogether besides the Purpose, seeing it is not the Contents of that Passage the Committee quarrels ; — and therefore, tho' I am far from thinking the Professors Observation upon human Nature true, as is evident from the Case of our first Parents, who were then all Mankind ; and newly come out of their Maker's Hands

Hands, yet they would have fled from him if they could : I will not stay to manifest it.

The last Part of his Answer, tho' nearer the Purpose, is still unsatisfying : For the Committee would not have quarrelled his giving a Direction in the Terms he mentions ; but that which they quarrel, is, that through the whole Sermon, God, by the Designation of Creator, without Relation to a Mediator, is so often and only presented as the Object of Worship, to Christians deeply convinced of their Sin and Danger, and therefore such as might see from the glorious Perfections of Holiness, Veracity and Justice, essential to the Deity, they could expect nothing but Wrath and Vengeance from him. —

Mr. Leechman hath not been lucky in his Choice of Scriptures,—for *Psal. xlvi.* evidently sets forth God with Relation to a Mediator and the Covenant of Grace.—This will be easily made out if it be disputed.— And as to the second Scripture, *i. Pet. iv. 19.* The Attribute *faithful*, annexed to Creator, which respects the Promise and the Covenant of Grace, shews that Creator respect God, not in the first Creation but the second.

Let the Venerable Assembly, and the World now judge whether the Committee of Presbytery, had best Reason to be dissatisfied with the Professor's Answer to their first Remark ; or the Reverend Synod to be satisfied, upon Reasons not known, and which never can be known now, because that Meeting of the Synod assigned no Reason for their Sentence.

Altho' that the Committee and Presbytery have not proceeded to judge of Professor Leechman's Answers ; we who are the Representatives of the Presbytery of Glasgow, in this Venerable Assembly, beg Leave to mark down some of these Reasons, why we and others are far from being satisfied with these Answers ; but our Grounds of Offence, for the greatest Part, remain unremoved.— especially considering that the mere judicial Declaration of the Synod, without assigning one Reason why, we have not found hitherto, hath had any Influence upon us, or others, either to enlighten or convince.

Second,

Second, In his Discourse upon the Nature of Prayer, in which he proposes to set it in its true Light, by stripping it of every thing foreign and superfluous, and which stands in his Book as a finished Piece, there is no mention made of the Merits and Intercession of our blessed Saviour and Redeemer, which we think is expressly contrary to *Act 7th Assem. 1736.* The chief Design of which is, to excite Ministers and Preachers to guard against the great Prejudice that our Religion must sustain, not only by opposing, but also by neglecting and disregarding, or too superficially handling of the blessed Truths of the Gospel concerning Christ, and his Mediation, &c. and which Act also directs them to make it the great Scope of their Sermons, to lead Men to Christ, and a Covenant of Grace, for Life and Salvation; and directs Presbyteries to inquire concerning the Observation of this Act: It seems also not to come up to the Description of Prayer, given in our *Larger and Shorter Catechism*, which take in the Name of Jesus Christ as an essential Ingredient of Prayer.

Answer. To this let it be observed, *imo*, That the Author has expressly fixed and determined the Meaning of these Words, *foreign and superfluous Circumstances*; by their Connection with what goes before. For he has taken Notice, in the Introduction, that the low and superstitious Practices of well-meaning People, and the Perversions of wicked and designing Men, have been one Ground of the Contempt into which Prayer is fallen among one Part of the World, and therefore, in order to remove these Causes of Contempt, he proposes to describe Prayer, stript of all these foreign and superfluous Circumstances, which have been one great Cause of its falling into Disesteem, the Word (*therefore*) evidently connects the Sentence in which it is inserted, with the Introduction, which goes immediately before; since then the Words, *foreign and superfluous Circumstances*, are mutually and necessarily explained and determined by superstitious Practices, mentioned in the Introduction, if the Reverend Committee suspects that I intend to represent the Doctrine of

of the Mediation and Intercession of Jesus Christ, as one of the superstitious Doctrines of well-meaning Men, or one of the Abuses of wicked and designing Men, I know no Remedy for those who allow themselves to entertain such malicious and unbounded Suspicions, but praying to God for them, that he may teach them not to judge lest they be judged : But as I chuse rather to think, that the Committee has not attended to the Connection of the Discourse, than that they have intended to represent me as guilty of Blasphemy, by pointing out the Doctrine of the Intercession of Jesus as mere Superstition : Let it be observed in the

2d Place, That when the Committee asserts, that my Discourse on the Nature of Prayer stands as a finished Piece, they seem to mean, that as it stands, it is a full and complete Account of the Doctrine of the *Confession of Faith*, and of the New Testament, concerning Prayer. Now, that I did not intend that Discourse for a complete System of the Scripture Doctrines, and the Doctrine of our Standards, concerning Prayer, is evident, *imo*, Because it is expressly limited to one of the three Parts of Prayer, mentioned by our Standards, in the Sermon, *Page 4.* near the Bottom. *2do*, Because it is further restrained by the Division of the Discourse (in the same Page) where it is not proposed to consider either the Ground of Acceptance in Prayer, or the Qualifications in the Person necessary to render his Prayer acceptable ; some of the Qualifications of the Person who prays, are indeed mentioned, but it is only in a transient manner, but they are not fully explained or illustrated, and other very essential Qualifications are intirely omitted ; for Instance a forgiving Temper is made an essential Qualification of Prayer by our blessed Saviour, *Mat. vi. 12, 14, 15. Verses*, and yet I have not mentioned it. Now, will the Reverend Committee conclude from that Omission, that I intend to point it out as one of the superstitious Circumstances, of which Prayer must be stripped. *3ro*, The Bulk that the Answers to the Objections against Prayer bear in the Sermon, plainly shews, that they were the principal Thing

Thing intended in it. And 4^{to}, Because this Sermon which was now printed, was only one Discourse enlarged out of eight or nine delivered from the same Text, at the same Time this Sermon was first preached, when I spoke at a considerable Length on the Doctrine of the Intercession of Jesus. 3^{to}, I cannot help thinking, that this Remark of the Reverend Committee, would have been very Groundless and Uncharitable, even tho' the Sermon had not born such evident Marks of its not being intended, for a complete Account of the Doctrine of Prayer; how is it possible to imagine, that true Candour could ever have interpreted, " stripping Prayer of its foreign and superfluous Circumstances", to be stripping it of the Mediation and Intercession of Jesus Christ, when the same Author, in the very same Sermon, expresses his Regard for these Doctrines, in the most Solemn Manner imaginable, even in an Address, to the Heart-searching, and Righteous Judge of all the Earth? And when the same Author, in another printed Sermon, inculcates it as the Duty of all Ministers, to treat these Subjects not in a transient or superficial manner, but at great Length, as being of the utmost Importance? When the same Author has frequently preached before Thousands in the Town of Glasgows (where the Remark is made) on these very Subjects: And the Person every time he Prays, does it in the Name of Jesus Christ, of which he has as many Witnesses as there are Persons, who ever heard him Pray, either in private or publick: So that there is not the least Ground for representing me, as transgressing the Act of Assembly 1736.

4^{to}, As the Reverend Committee has not attended to the Limitations given to the Subject, so they have not observed the Characters, and Turn of Thinking, of the Persons for whose Instruction or Information 'tis intended, the Author thinks he has plainly marked them out in the *Introduction*: It is such as have a determined Contempt of Prayer; such as treat the Example and the Precepts of Jesus Christ, concerning Prayer, in a slight and contemptuous Manner. Now such Persons must either be confirm-

ed Deists or Scepticks; the last of these do always call themselves Christians; and sometimes the former too, and are willing to embrace the Doctrine of Revelation concerning the moral Character of God, and the Precepts concerning the moral Virtues, tho' they reject peculiar Doctrines of Christianity; and that some of both these Sorts of Men have imbibed strange Prejudices against Devotion, and especially against Prayer, is well known to these who are acquainted with the World. That such Persons are apt to be fortified in their Prejudices, by such Books as are written with a Design to ridicule Devotion, must also be acknowledged: That some Persons were actually confirmed in their Prejudices against Religion, by a late Pamphlet, which endeavoured to represent all Devotion as absurd and unreasonable; nay, as an impious and blasphemous Practice, some have had particular Occasion to know: Now, if this is the Case, can the Reverend Committee condemn a well designed Attempt to remove Prejudices, and reconcile Mens Minds to such an important Branch of Religion as Prayer is? Is there any Precept of Divine Revelation, any Dictate of Reason, any Act of Assembly, which forbids to make any Application to such Persons, for their Reformation? Or that forbids us to reason with them on such Principles, as are owned by them, and just in themselves? And if such Persons are partly prejudiced against Prayer, by observing, that absurd Forms of it are sometimes used; that needless Repetitions, tedious Informations, without any Mixture either of Prayer or Praise, and many other superstitious Practices pass, in the World, for true Devotion; Can any one be blamed, for stripping Prayer of these foreign and superfluous Circumstances, and placing it in its true Light? Must a Person be represented as an Enemy to all Christian Prayer, because he has endeavoured to show, that Prayer is a Duty, even by the Light of Nature? Must not Men first be reconciled to Prayer itself, and be convinced that 'tis a reasonable Thing, before they can be reconciled to praying in the Name of Christ? And if in reasoning with Persons prejudiced against Prayer, an

Author

Author reasons not only from the Light of Nature, but also from such Parts of Divine Revelation, as they will not much dispute to be agreeable to the moral Character of God, owned by themselves ; Can he be justly blamed, because he does not reason from other Parts of Divine Revelation, which they absolutely reject ? Is it not evident to every intelligent Reader, that if I had introduced the Doctrine of the Intercession of Christ, into the Description of the Nature of Prayer, that I must also, according to the Method proposed, have answered the Objections against it ? But that was not my present Design, that would have been a new Subject ; and the one I have handled is, in the Nature of the Thing, previous to it ; so that the Complaint of omitting this Doctrine of Revelation, amounts only to this : Why did I not handle another Branch of the Doctrine of Prayer ? Or why did I not publish another Sermon on this other Subject ?

For my own Part, as I am conscious to myself, that I composed this Sermon in a good Disposition, and with a good Intention ; (and I hope that, to my Readers, it bears the Marks of both) and as I have particular Occasion to know, that, in some Instances, it has been of Use (by the Divine Blessing) to reconcile prejudiced Minds to the Theory, I hope also to the Practice of Prayer, I am possessed of an inward Satisfaction of Mind, which the whole World cannot rob me of ; and after all the Clamour that has been raised, I still approve of the Sermon's being sent abroad.

Mr. Leechman's first Answer to the Committee's second Remark is, *That foreign and superfluous Circumstances which he promiseth to strip Prayer of, in the Description he proposeth to give of it, are determined by superstitious Practices mentioned in the Introduction, a one Cause of Prayer's falling into Contempt and Disesteem among one Part of the World ; — because he proposeth therefore, to describe Prayer stript of all these foreign and superfluous Circumstances.* — Here let it be observed first, That the Professor slips in these in his Answers, which is not in the Sermon ; and if it had, woul-

have referred to low Superstition, or something said before ; but not being in the Sermon, *therefore*, which is for the most Part but a Word of Course in such Transitions, can never make such a Connection here, as that foreign and superfluous Circumstances, is necessarily the same with the low Superstition mentioned in the *Introduction*. — 2dly. Supposing it is so, as the Professor saith, he knows very well, that Deists and Scepticks, for whom, he asserts, this Sermon was designed, reckon the Merits and Intercession of Jesus Christ, taken into Prayer, to be the low Superstition of well-meaning Men, and one of the Abuses of wicked and designing Men ; — and are more prejudiced against Christian Prayer thereby, than by the Instances Mr. Leechman gives of this low Superstition, and Abuses, in these same *Answers*, — viz. *Absurd Forms of Prayer, needless Repetitions, tedious Informations, without any Mixture of Prayer or Praise*. — The Committee have not charged, in their *Remark*, Mr. Leechman, with intending to represent the Doctrine of the Mediation and Intercession of Jesus, as one of the superstitious Doctrines, &c. — but are sorry that Mr. Leechman, by a total Omission of the Doctrine of the Merit and Intercession of Jesus Christ, an essential Ingredient in the Doctrine of Prayer, in his Description of Prayer, after the Proposital he makes of the Kind of Description he is to give : That the said Professor hath given a Handle to the Deists, to judge, that the Doctrine mentioned, and which they reckon of, as hath been said, is no very necessary Ingredient in Prayer. — And they do expressly charge Mr. Leechman with neglecting and disregarding the blessed Truths of the Gospel, concerning Christ and his Mediation, contrary to *Act 7th of Ass. 1736*, which Mediation is taken into the Description of the very limited Part of Prayer, he professeth to treat of, *PETITION*, in our Standards, where it is described in the fewest Words, as an essential Ingredient. — The Committee acknowledge, That Mens secret Intentions are not the Subject of human Inquiry, and were far from judging Mr. Leechman's Intentions. — As to overt Acts, what the Com-

Committee's Second Remark cites, is cited justly.—The General Principle upon which the Remark proceeds, is evidently this, *In professed Explication of a most important Subject (as Prayer) to omit wholly an essential principal Part, (as praying in Christ's Name) is a very unsafe Way of Teaching, and an Omission of dangerous Kind.*— And is it not evident, that when a professed Explication is exceptionable, on Account of so dangerous an Omission; it is the more so, that it is ulthered in with Characterising, in general, the Things to be omitted, as foreign and superfluous?

If the real Scope was to describe deistical Prayer; Was it not strange to call this explaining Prayer stripped of Superfluities? — If the real Scope was to describe Christian Prayer, Was it not strange to characterize his Description, as omitting Superfluities, when it was to omit praying in Christ's Name? — If it be said, it was neither Deistical nor Christian Prayer, but *Prayer in general*, or the Things in Prayer common to both these Kinds of it, that the Author intended; even on this Supposition, Was it safe to call an Explication of Prayer, stripped of Christianity, an Explication stripped of Superfluities?

It is a great Prejudice against the Meaning the Author, in his *Answer*, puts upon these Words, *foreign* and *superfluous*, viz. low Superstitions and Perversions, mentioned a little before, That, in the common Use of Words, Things that are *noxious* are never called *foreign* and *superfluous*. — Would any call it a stripping Prayer of Things foreign and superfluous, to strip it of Hardness of Heart, Unbelief, or the like? — Besides, Mr. Leechman, laying down his Plan, proposes to strip Prayer not merely of these particular Things he had mentioned, but expressly of *all* foreign and superfluous Circumstances.

In fine, tho' the Words about stripping, &c. had not been inserted, proposing to *explain* the *Nature* of Prayer, and to set it in its true Light, and to take Notice of the principal Acts of it, justifies this Remark of the Committee, on the Author's omitting so essential and principal Part.

Before we proceed to the Consideration of the following Answers, it is and will be of after Use to observe, That the Remark notices the omitting of Regards due to Christ's *Merit* and *Intercession*; instead of these Words, the Professor, in his *Answers*, substitutes *Mediation* and *Intercession*, and, a little below, *Intercession* itself.

As to Mr. Leechman's second Answer, the Committee, when they assert, in their second Remark, that the Author's Discourse on the Nature of Prayer stands in his Book as a finished Piece, they evidently meant, that he had finished what he had proposed to do first, *viz.* describe the Nature of Prayer, as limited by him, set it in its true Light, and stripped of all foreign and superfluous Circumstances; — That the Author had finished what he had proposed, and, having done so, proceeded to another Head of Discourse.— Their Words don't imply, that he proposed a complete System of the Christian Doctrine concerning Prayer.— They judged they had sufficient Reason to condemn the Omission of so essential and principal a Part, as Praying in Christ's Name: That the Author expressly proposes to explain the Nature of Prayer, tho' chiefly restricted to Petition, as distinguished from Confession and Thanksgiving, — to set it in its true Light, leaving out Superfluities, — and to take Notice of the principal Acts of Mind exerted in it.

Mr. Leechman argues, that *answering Objections was the chief Thing intended in this Composure.* — But this is the Scope of the second Part; that of the First is *Explication*: To this first Part the Committee's Remark principally refers. — They have made no Remark on the second Part, but these on p. 36, and 37.

He adds, *He spoke at Length on Christ's Intercession, in other Sermons on Prayer, from this very Text.* — It is sufficient to observe now, that, without speaking at much Length on his Intercession, a very little on it, in this Sermon, as founded on his Satisfaction might have prevented very strong and just Exceptions.

As to the Defence taken from the Expressions in the Prayer at the End, about Christ's Mediation, (his Intercession)

cession is not mentioned there, tho' here Mr. Leechman seems to think it is) it is sufficient to observe now, referring other Things to Remark 9th, and Answers to it, That mentioning these Doctrines on another Occasion, cannot justify omitting Prayer in Christ's Name, when professedly explaining the Nature of Prayer: — Such Omission is not vindicated, by being inconsistent with, or unsuitable to, the Sermons a Man may have delivered, — to Prayers he hath put up, — or to the Rules about Preaching which himself may have laid down.

As to the general Rule in the Synod Sermon, p. 28. at the Foot, it relates to all the Truths delivered by Revelation in general, as well as these particularly mentioned a little before, (of which Christ's Intercession is none)

— His Atonement is indeed mentioned in two Lines, and less insisted on than the general Influence of his good Doctrine and Example, which is one of the Characters of the New Method, in the Instances where that Doctrine is mentioned at all. — Does not this Author know, that his general good Expressions about Atonement for Sins, and perhaps stronger than these, are used by the Denyers of the true Doctrine of Christ's Redemption, or complete Satisfaction. — After the Rule about treating revealed Doctrines otherways than in a superficial Way, there is indeed a good deal in p. 29, and 30. about the Importance of certain revealed Truths: — But tho' there is indeed general Mention of Christ as Mediator, and a good deal about the Importance of his prophetick and kingly Offices: — Is there one Word on the Importance of the Doctrine of his Satisfaction, in express or equivalent Terms? — Can it be said, that the above Rule is well observed, even in the above Sermon, where it is delivered? — Can it excuse omitting Prayer in Christ's Name, in a professed Explication of Prayer, published to the World, that one has treated on Christ's Mediation, (it is not said his Merit and Satisfaction) and Intercession, or prays in Christ's Name, in Prayers and Sermons that are *not published?* — If Men could have an infallible Certainty of a Minister's having the firmest Persuasion in his own Heart, of Truths which

he

the wrongs by the most culpable Kinds of Omissions, whether would it excuse his Omissions, or aggravate them?

As to the fourth Branch of Mr. Leechman's Answer to Remark 2d, a good Part of it is considered, and shewn insufficient, in the Communing above related, and the Digression annexed,—and to this I refer.— When one proposeth to explain Prayer to a Christian Audience, it is reasonable to suppose, that it is their Instruction that is intended, and not merely that of Deists ; of whom it is not to be thought, that there would be any Number ; unless it be true, which God forbid, what *Cumming*, the Author of the above-mentioned Pamphlet, is laid to have declared, that he found more Deists in *Glasgow* than in *London*.—It is notour indeed, that these who are looked on to be such, are amougst the greatest Sticklers for this Sermon.— However, intending the Instruction of these last cannot justify one's professing to explain the Nature of Prayer, and treat of the principal Acts of it, and at the same time to omit so essential a Part as that so oft mentioned ; —— yea, supposing this, how needful was it to give Intimation of this, both for the Sake of Christian Hearers, that they might not rest in that Sort of Prayer, and for the Sake of such Unbelievers, that they might not think it sufficient, or have a Handle for saying, that Prayer, tho' *without Regard to Christ*, is, or may be, Prayer set in its true Light ?

Seeing none blame Mr. Leechman for reasoning against Deists, in Defence of Prayer, (whether we have such a Controversy with them, or not, is not in this Observe the Question) why doth he insist so long here in vindicating that good Office ? — Is it candid to insinuate, that the Remarkers blame him for defending Prayer ? — Is it not plain, that it is not for defending Prayer ; but for a dangerous Way of explaining it, that he is excepted against ?

Where is he blamed in the Remarks, as he seems to say, for endeavouring to shew, that Prayer is a Duty even by the Light of Nature ? — Shewing or proving that Prayer is a Duty by the Light of Nature, is a different

serent Thing from giving an Explication, especially a wrong Explication, of it? The last is what is blamed, and not the first, which he doth not.— Where doth he prove this, that Prayer is a Duty, even by the Light of Nature? What Arguments doth he make Use of? What acknowledged Principles of the Deists doth he argue with them from, to convince them of this Duty of Natural Religion? If this be any-where in the Sermon, we have no-where found Fault with it.

In going on, he seems to reckon it evident to the Intelligent, that his *Explication* should not extend to more than what he intended to *vindicate* from Objections, and therefore should not comprehend Regards to Christ's Intercession; (he says nothing of his Merit) whence it would indeed follow, that these Regards were *foreign* to his Scope, since he was not to vindicate them.— Instead of all this, what must appear evident to many intelligent Persons is, that when one expressly proposes to explain the Nature of Prayer to a Christian Audience, he ought by no Means to omit so principal a Part as due Regard to Christ, whether he is to treat of Objections against it or not;— and that if it was his Intention, that his *Explication* and his *Vindications* were to be of equal Extent, he should have told so, and *proposed* only to explain *some important Things* in Prayer, which he was to defend from Objections.— It is by no Means a just Defence to all Eyes, that tho' the declared Scope implied omitting no essential Ingredient of Petition, the real Scope was to omit the Christian Part altogether, because it was not intended to be vindicated from Objections; — while it is obvious, this was as needful, in dealing with Deists, &c. as any thing whatever.— And we are of Opinion, that the Author had addressed himself to the Deists more to the Purpose, if he had proven and vindicated praying in the Name of Christ, which they deny; — than by proving and vindicating Prayer to be a Duty of Natural Religion, which the Body of them acknowledge as much as we.

It is surprising, that he seems to say, that, according to his proposed Method, he was to explain only what he was to vindicate from Objections: Whoever reads the Words wherein his Method is proposed, will find no such Restriction.

As to what he says about his good Disposition, it proves only, that he thinks a Minister may have a Disposition becoming the Gospel, notwithstanding of such Inattention, (which seems to be the most favourable Construction that can possibly be put on the Omissions, and other Grounds of Exception) Inattention to *1 Cor. ii. 2. Gal. vi. 14. Phil. iii. 8.*

As to his Intention, the Goodness of the End cannot justify wrong Means.

Reconciling Men to Deistical Prayer, without any suitable Warning of the Insufficiency of it, is no great Argument in favours of this Discourie.

Third. That the Author of the Sermon having described Prayer as mentioned in the former Proposition, he again and again asserts, that the Person thus praying shall be heard and accepted of God; which we conceive to be contrary to *Confession of Faith*, Chap. 21. Sect. 3. as also to *Larger Catechism*, Answer to Question, *What is it to pray in the Name of Christ?* And likeways to Answer to the Question, *Why are we to pray in the Name of Christ?*

Answer. The Author does not remember that he once asserted, that these who pray in the Manner he describes shall be heard and accepted; and the Committee has pointed out no Passage when he has once used these Words: But, if there is any thing in this Remark, it seems to coincide with the following one.

The short Answer given to this third Remark seems to imply, that to promise to explain Prayer, and set it in its true Light, is a different Thing from promising to explain the Prayer that will be heard and accepted of God.

— Was it not a dangerous Omission, not to warn the Audience and the Readers of this, and, instead of that,

to

to use Ways of Speaking so directly leading them to think otherways.

What is the Meaning of the Word *Advantages* of Prayer, in the Title, if *Acceptance* is not intended, or if it was not acceptable Prayer the Nature of which was to be treated of?

Doth not our Author assert again and again, from p. 7, to 12. That the Person praying with such Prayer as he describes the Nature of, (for so his Words must necessarily be understood) *shall obtain his Requests, God will accomplish his Desires*, and that he ought to have a firm Belief, and assured Trust, of it?

From this 'tis evident, that this Answer is as unsatisfying as the former, and that the Committee's third Remark stands in its full Force.

Fourth. The Author teaches a Trust and Confidence in God, encouraged from the Consideration of his infinite Mercy, p. 7, 8, and 59. and the Manifestations he as Creator hath given Mankind, of his glorious Perfections, as employed for their Safety and Welfare, p. 12. l. 10. from the Foot, without any Relation to the Mediation of Jesus Christ, and the Covenant of Promises founded on him : Contrary, as we conceive, to *Larger Catechism*, Answer to the Question, *What is Justifying Faith?* Where Faith and Trust include not only Assent to the Truths of the Gospel Promise, but a Receiving and Resting upon Christ, and his Righteousness therein held forth; as also to *Confess.* Chap. 14. Sect. 2. where the principal Acts of Faith are, accepting, receiving, and resting upon, Christ alone, for Justification, Sanctification, and eternal Life, by Virtue of the Covenant of Grace.

Answer. The Author is not directly treating of the Grounds of Acceptance in Prayer, in p. 7, and 8. The Grounds of Acceptance are not proposed to be considered, in the Beginning of the Discourse : The principal Thing the Author has in View, thro' the whole first Head of the Discourse, is to describe the inward Acts of Mind exerted in Prayer, and without descending to a particular Explication of the several Grounds and Encou-

rage-

gements of being heard in praying. All that the Author is asserting on this Head is this, That none would ever pray, if they had not some Hope and Trust that they would be the better of praying; and indeed no Creature that acts rationally would ever pray, if they did not hope and expect some Advantage from praying: And therefore the Author asserts, that some Degree of Hope and Trust is a necessary Ingredient of Prayer; and that this was the Author's chief Design, is evident from his express Words, p. 4. at the Bottom, and p. 5. at the Top. If the Author has departed a little from his Method proposed, and suggested any thing concerning the Foundations of Hope and Trust, it is express almost wholly in the very Words of Jesus Christ himself, and the other inspired Authors. And the Use that he makes of those Promises of the holy Scriptures, is to reason from them with the Deists and Scepticks, (the People with whom he has to do) that they are more fully satisfactory to the human Mind, and afford a stronger Ground of Trust, than the general Conclusions of the Light of Nature. As to what is objected against p. 59. the Author has mentioned the Revelation of the Will of God several Times, in the Prayer, before that Expression: And the Scheme of Redemption is a Part, an important Part too, of the great Plan of universal Providence. Besides, the Manner of Speaking is countenanced by our *Shorter Catechism*, in the Answer to the Question, *How doth God execute his Decrees?* As to p. 12. l. 10. from the Foot, the Author is not speaking of the Grounds of Acceptance in Prayer, but of these Views of Things which ought to lead Men to pray; and all that he asserts is, that a Sense of the Imperfection of Human Nature, and the Manifestations God hath given of himself in the Works of Creation and Providence, ought to lead even these to pray who do not enjoy the Benefit of divine Revelation: This seems to be agreeable to the *Confession of Faith*, first Sentence, and to *Romans i. 19, 20, 21.*

The Professor's Answer to the fourth Remark of the Committee gives as little Satisfaction as the former.

If the Professor say, that his Scope was to explain Deistical Prayer, his Commendation of what he has described, and his Way of Speaking about the Hope of Acceptance, appear highly dangerous both to Christians and Deists.—If he say, it is a Christian Duty he is describing, the Objection still stands unanswered, yea unanswerable, taken from his omitting the Regards due to Jesus Christ.

When Mr. Leechman says, he had only asserted the Necessity of *some* Hope and Trust, and, a little below, *some* Degree of Hope and Trust; this is perhaps, in some Respects, the most surprising Thing in his Answers:—For, in the End of p. 7. and the Beginning of p. 8. he expressly terms it a firm Belief and assured Trust.

When he apologizes for, what he calls, departing a little from his Method, by suggesting something about the Ground of Hope; he makes this his Excuse, that *what he has on that Head is mostly in Scripture Words.*—Now, seeing his Busines is to excuse omitting Christ, while he does not some other Grounds of Hope; — is it an Excuse for making this Difference, that the Things not omitted, but expressed, are expressed in Scripture Words? — Was there not Plenty of such Words for expressing the Regards of Hope to Christ, as well as to any other Grounds, yea and the Regards of all the other Grounds of Hope to him?

But another Character he mentions of some Grounds of Hope he had spoken of, is, that *they were more fully satisfactory to the human Mind, &c. than the general Conclusions of the Light of Nature.*—As to this, is it not proper to hint at two Things? — *imo*, Is not that Character of Tendency or Efficacy far superior on more full Satisfaction, as applicable to what he has omitted, as to what he has not? — It cannot be pretended here, that the Promises of the Word, the Ground here assigned, are more acknowledged by the Deists, than Christ? — If all this is so, how will it justify the Difference Mr. Leechman has made? — *zdo*, Where the Character given of revealed Grounds of Hope is, that they are *more fully satisfactory*,

tisfactory, &c. was it not needful to warn Deists, in the Christian World, of their Danger, if they rested in unrevealed Grounds, as in some *Degree satisfactory*, tho' not so fully so?

As to p. 59. tho' it is certain, that, as the Author says, Redemption is one important Part of the Plan of Providence, (in the large Sense of that Word) is it not equally certain, that the Curse of the Law, and the Execution of it in the Damnation of the Impenitent, is another Part of it, and a very important Part of it? — Is there anything in the Passage, p. 59. to determine on what Part of the Plan the Sinner's unbounded Confidence is built? — Is it not evident, that it is not on any one Part, but the *Properties and Perfections* of the Whole; and that the *Perfections of Providence* (the Belief of which is one of the first Principles of Natural Religion) are here substituted in the Room of the *perfect Merits of Christ*, as founding the Sinner's highest Confidence? — Is not this Persuasion of the mere general Properties of Providence, which is a Principle of mere Natural Religion, a quite different Thing from Knowledge or Persuasion of these *particular Parts* of Providence discoverable only by Revelation? — And therefore to suppose, that Confidence in the Perfections of Providence is equivalent to, or includes Faith in Christ for Salvation, is both contrary to the common Use of Language, and to the Form of sound Words in the first Sentence of our *Confession*, which teaches, *That the Works of Providence are insufficient to shew the Way of Salvation.* — So, supposing a good Meaning were forced upon the Author's Position, it would still be a Violation of *Act 12. Assem. 1710*, which prohibits Expressions disagreeing with the *Form of sound Words* in our Standards, such as the above-cited Part of our *Catechisms*, about justifying Faith, as including a resting upon Christ for Salvation: In regard the Position atcribes that Influence to the *Perfections of Providence*, and Faith or Persuasion thereof, which our Standards appropriate to the *perfect Merits of Christ*, and *Faith in him*.

As to p. 12. l. 10. Tho', when Prayer is said to be founded on the Imperfections of human Nature, the Meaning may be what Mr. Leechman mentions: Yet, when Prayer is said to have a Foundation in the Manifestation of God's Perfections, as employed for our Welfare, the most natural Meaning is, that such a Manifestation is an Encouragement to it.—Our Imperfections are Inducements to it, as they shew our Need of it: Manifestations of God's Perfections, as they encourage to Hope.—And this is the very Thing the Committee quarrel, that it is asserted, hat there is any Manifestation of God's Perfections, as im-
ployed for our Welfare, but in Christ, and the Work of our Redemption by him, that encourageth Sinners to hope for Acceptance with God.

Fifth. The Author seems to them to insinuate, that there are some of Mankind, who, without the Benefit of Revelation, are capable to reason out to themselves such a Knowledge of God, as may be sufficient to their attaining to eternal Happiness; which Propositions is contrary to *Confession of Faith, Chap. 1. Sect. 1.* "Altho', &c. As also, to *Larger Catechism, Answer to Question, How does it appear that there is a God?*

Answer. The Author positively denies that he has either said, or insinuated, what the Committee charges him with in this *Remark, viz.* All that the Author has said here, is no more than an *argumentum ad hominem*; it is no more than this, That it must be acknowledged, even by Deists and Scepticks, who think a System of Religion can be reasoned out by the Light of Nature; that a Revelation is a much easier Way of attaining it, and much more fitted to the Capacities and Situation of the Bulk of Mankind: Tho' this were really all that I intended, and had no Design of delivering any Sentiment of my own, concerning the Ability of Mankind to reason out the Knowledge of God, and of true Religion; yet, lest this should be thought an artful evading of an Inference drawn by the Committee, which was otherways unanswerable, I shall therefore endeavour to show, that there is nothing in what I have said contrary to the *Scriptures or Con-*

Confession of Faith. That the Heathens were capable of reasoning out a clear Character of the Diety, is expressly asserted by the Apostle *Paul*, *Rom.* i. 19, 20, 21, such a clear Character as should have led them to glorify him. The *Confession of Faith* asserts the same Thing, in Effect, in the very first Sentence of it, and adduces this Passage of the Apostle to prove it. But how the Committee came to draw this Inference, that I asserted, that some of Mankind could reason out to themselves such a Knowledge of God as is sufficient to eternal Life, is extremely surprising: For, tho' I had asserted, (which I have not done, nor is it my Opinion) that some of the Heathens could have reasoned out as clear a Character of the Diety, and as clear a Connection betwixt Virtue and Happiness, as the Scriptures have revealed; it could not be inferred, even from that Assertion, that I had said, that some of the Heathens could, by the Light of Nature, attain to such a Knowledge of God as is sufficient to their attaining eternal Happiness: For, according to our Standards, it is not the speculative Knowledge of God, (which is the Thing I am speaking of) however clear it be, even with the Clearness of Revelation itself, that is sufficient for attaining Salvation; but that Saving Knowledge, which is produced by the Influence of the Holy Spirit. Thus the *Confession of Faith*, *Chap.* i. *Sect.* i. allows, that there is a very considerable Degree of speculative Knowledge attainable by the Light of Nature, while, at the same Time, it denies, that saving Knowledge is attainable by it. And in the same *Chap.* *Sect.* 6. This Distinction is more expressly established in these Words; "Nevertheless we acknowledge, that the inward Illumination of the Spirit is necessary for the saving understanding of such Truths as are revealed in the Word." From these Considerations, I hope, it appears evidently, that there is no Appearance of Contradiction here to our Standards.

As to the Committee's fifth Remark, it is founded upon these Words, especially of the Context, p. 9. of the Sermon, — *That great Numbers of Mankind could never have reasoned out to themselves a clear and just Cha-*

Character of the Deity, nor inferred from it, that he would constantly and universally connect Felicity with Virtue. — They, the Committee, judged, that it was a very natural Consequence from this, that some of Mankind might be able to reason out such a clear Character of the Deity, as to infer from it, that he would constantly, &c. — especially considering, that the Author, after he hath shewn the Advantage of Revelation, to such of Mankind, as could not reason out to themselves a just and clear Character of the Deity, &c. — adds, in Substance, that, at the same Time, there is good Ground to hope, that God will give Wisdom, Virtue and Happiness, to all who ask him with unfeigned Sincerity of Heart, even tho' they never heard of these comfortable Promises, on which our Souls rest securely. — See the Reasonings founding this Remark.

Now tho', in this *Answer*, the Author owns, That Heathens could not reason out to themselves so clear and just a Character of the Diety, and so clear a Connection between Virtue and Happiness, as the Scriptures have revealed ; yet, the following Things are not disowned ; And was it not needful to disown them ? *1mo*, That tho' there is not the same Clearness, there may be a Sufficiency in the Light of Nature, as well as Revelation, for the Purpose in View. — *2do*, That the Connection between Virtue and Happiness (the Virtue or the Reformation of a Sinner) is a sufficient Foundation of Hope. — But what is most dissatisfying is, that the Author seems to put the Light of Nature, and of Scripture, upon a Level, as to Sufficiency and Insufficiency, tho' not as to Clearness and Obscurity ? — Is it not notour, that the Sufficiency ascribed to the Scripture, and distinguishing it from the Light of Nature, is a Sufficiency, not exclusive of the Need of internal subjective Illumination, but of the Need of farther objective Revelation : — A Sufficiency in the Order of Means to which it belongs : — A Sufficiency, as to objective Discovery of satisfying Grounds of Hope, and complete Rules of Duty. — This very Sufficiency, the Author seems, by the Application of the Distinction, to

ascribe to the Light of Nature;— and to deny no other Sufficiency to it, than what is denied to belong to the Holy Scriptures.

Sixth. The Committee finds, That in the Objection, as it is laid, p. 36, 'tis directly asserted, “That Punishments threatened to be inflicted on Sinners, in this and an eternal World, are intended, by our kind Creator, for our Reformation and Amendment.” And in the Answer to this Objection, this Proposition, tho’ false in itself, and dangerous in its Consequences, is not disowned or disclaimed; tho’ such a Way of Speaking and Teaching be also contrary to our Standards, *viz.* *Confession of Faith, Chap. 3. Parag. 7. and Chap. 6. Parag. 6.*

Answer, The Author both in the Objection, and in the Answer, is so far from saying, that there are no other Punishments, but what are intended for Reformation and Amendment, that he plainly expresses the contrary, according to the common Use of Language, that there are other Punishments: For the Words in the Objection, “Those Sufferings, &c. necessarily suppose, other Sufferings.” Punishments destined for our Reformation, in the Answer, also necessarily supposes that there are other Punishments, not destined for Reformation. If I should say, those Men are unsound in their Principles, it necessarily supposes, that there are other Men who are not so. *2do,* That there are other Punishments, is expressly taught in the following Page, l. 17. and 18. from the Top. *3rd,* For the clearing of this whole Passage from all Ground of Cavil and Suspicion, let it be observed, that the Objection is first stated in general, What Use can Prayer be of, for obtaining Pardon of Sin, and Deliverance from those Punishments threatened, to be inflicted on Sinners in this and an eternal World? After this general State of the Objection, the first part of it (*viz.* How can Prayer deliver us, or contribute, as a Mean, to deliver us from the Punishments of this Life?) is taken up and urged in the following Terms. If Sin deserves Punishment (*viz.* in this Life) and if Punishment is necessary, &c. and so on to the End of the Objection: Then the Answer is given

given to this first Part of the Objection, That a Sense of our Faults, &c. to the End of the 36th p. Now the Reason why the Author has not returned, and stated and urged the second Part of the Objection, at full Length, viz. How can Prayer be a Mean of delivering of us from the eternal Punishments of another World? is this, that he thought it needless, and that it would appear to be so to the Reader; because, if Prayer is a Mean of preventing these temporal Punishments, which God inflicts on wicked Men, in order to awaken and convert them, by leading them to real Repentance, before they are inflicted: Then Prayer must be also a Mean of preventing those eternal Punishments which would have followed, upon their continuing in an impenitent State; and therefore, the Author, without formally stating the second Part of the Objection, which he thought was quite needless in his present Argument, after having stated the first Part; only adds, in Answer to the second Part, *and thus Prayers to, &c.* In the Top of p. 37. i. e. must be a Mean of securing also from the Punishments of an eternal World.

The principal Thing, in this Remark, is, That Mr. Leechman hath not disclaimed or disowned a Proposition so false and dangerous, — and which is known to have done, and to do great Mischief.

Mr. Leechman, in his Answer, endeavours to prove, That 'tis not contained in the Objection.—His Arguments are obviously weak and inconclusive. — This one Consideration is sufficient to convince, that the erroneous Proposition is contained in the Objection.—That the Objection is repeated from Mr. Cumming's Pamphlet. — Now, does not he make, *being for our Good*, the common Character of all Punishments, whether these in this, or an eternal World? — And that this is the same with intended and destined for our Reformation, — Mr. Leechman will not disown, that 'tis this Objection of Mr. Cumming's he is answering.

Mr. Leechman is not charged with the Proposition, but not disclaiming it, which he ought to have done; and 'tis highly dangerous he did it not; — but seeing, in his

Answers he expressly asserts the Eternity of Punishment, yet he knows very well it is different from Punishments in the eternal World, in the Opinion of some People; we are of Opinion he is not to be charged with the Proposition.

Seventh, That there is a natural (and therefore necessary) Connection betwixt the penitent Disposition, and the Pardon of our Sins, thereby superseding the Necessity of the Satisfaction of Christ, and the Constitution of God, which is contrary to our Standards, viz. *Confes.* Chap. 15th Par. 3d. Altho' Repentance, &c. and Chap. 11th Par. 1st. These, &c. and *Larger Catechism*, Answer to Question, *What doth every Sin deserve at the Hand of God?*

Answer, The Author asserts no Connection here, betwixt a penitent Disposition and the Pardon of Sin, but what is asserted in numberless Passages of the Holy Scriptures, as *Isa.* lv. 6, 7. *Acts* xxvi. 20. *Prov.* xxviii. 13. *He that confesseth, &c.* When the Author asserts, that Prayer and Alteration of Conduct, secures from these Punishments which must have ensued, &c. *Page* 37 l. 5, 6, 7, from the Top. That is no more than laying, that Repentance and Reformation are necessary Means or Conditions *sine qua non*, in both the Nature of Things, and positive Appointment of God, of obtaining Pardon of Sin, and eternal Life, which is perfectly consistent with the Doctrine of the Satisfaction of Christ, for the Sins of the World. Since the Scripture in innumerable Places asserts this Connection, betwixt Repentance and Forgiveness, without taking Notice, at that Time, of the Doctrine of Christ's Propitiation, how can any one be blamed, for asserting this Connexion, in the same manner that the Scripture does.

Reply. Mr. Leechman, in this Answer, mistakes the Passage of his Answer to the Objection *Page* 36, and 37. of his Sermon, the Committee found their 7th Remark upon.— For in these Answers under present Consideration, he expressly mentions *Page* 37 l. 5, 6, 7. from the Top, as the Passage referred to by the Committee, whereas it was

Page 36. l. 5th and following from the Foot, the Committee founded their Remark upon. *They naturally preclude the Necessity of Punishments, destin'd for our Reformation, &c.* — This Mistake, (I shall not say it was designed) renders this Answer altogether unsatisfying; and leaves the Committee's Remark in its full Strength. — This I pointed out to a principal Speaker, and Friend to Mr Leechman's Cause in the Synod, while they were upon this Article; but he took no Notice of it. — The express Words of the Remark about a *natural Connection*, might have pointed this out.

Mr. Leechman in answering both the sixth and seventh Remarks, speaks as if he had only made Prayer a Means of escaping Punishment: Now is it not evident and obvious, that a chief Thing excepted against in the Remarks, is not his making Prayer a Means; but his teaching that Prayer and other Duties he mentions? — First preclude the Necessity of Punishments. — *2do*, That they do this naturally. — *3to*, By gaining the End of them otherwise. And *4to*, It is evident, that what gains the *End* of Punishment, so as to preclude the Necessity of it, must gain the *whole end* of it: or the the whole that is of Importance: For what only gains any End in Part, cannot preclude the Necessity of other Means. — It is obvious *5to*, From the Tenor of the Answer, that it is the Reformation of the *particular penitent Offender* (and the Things connected with it) that is made thus the whole End of Punishment; and neither the Honour of the supreme Rector of the World, nor the Good of the reasonable Creation. — *Lafily*, That Prayer and the Dispositions it tends to promote, naturally tend to preclude the Necessity of all Punishments, *future or eternal*, as well as present. — This Mr. Leechman himself owns in his Anwers, namely that the last Sentence of his Answer to the Objection, relates to *future* as well as present Punishments.

If it shall be said, That the Meaning of *precluding naturally*, &c. is no more than that Reformation, &c. are *Conditions, sine qua non, in the nature of Things*: —

It

It is evident, there is a great Difference between these two Things, viz.—That Repentance is in the Nature of Things *necessary* for escaping Punishment, and that it is *naturally sufficient* to preclude the *Necessity* of Punishment, by gaining its End.—The Reasoning implies a *Sufficiency* to preclude *all Necessity*, and to gain the whole End, or all that is of Importance:—A *Sufficiency* of this Kind, what is it, but a *Sufficiency* to expiate Sin and satisfy Justice.

It is not, as he seems to suppose, mere omitting Christ's Satisfaction here, that the Remark blames: But ascribing what is the peculiar Glory, of that vicarious Punishment, to other Things.—This is not asserting the *Connection betwixt Repentance and Forgiveness*, in the same Manner that the Scripture does in any Passage; and it is inconsistent with the Manner in which it asserts it, in all the many Passages which treat of the Satisfaction of Christ.

This Passage appeared more exceptionable to the Committee, and others, because of its too great Affinity and Connection with other two Grounds of Exception above remarked on, as injurious to the same blessed Satisfaction? viz. First neglecting Acknowledgements of it as the Foundation of the Hope of Pardon and Happiness in handling Subjects of which such Acknowledgements are a *necessary Part*.—Secondly, substituting other Foundations of such Hope in its Room, particularly a Kind of natural Connection between the Sinners Virtue and Happiness: Not as Connections are established in the Covenant of Grace, between the different Blessings purchased by our Lord Jesus Christ: But flowing from an *invariable Law*, that always subsisted. See Sermon Page 9. at the Foot.—All which establisheth and teacheth a Way of Justification in the sight of God, independent upon the Satisfaction of Jesus Christ, and the Divine Constitution or Appointment.

Eighth, The Committee Observes, that the Passage cited Page 41 at the Beginning, appears to be altered.

Answer

Answer, The Author's Memory failed him here.

Ninth, The Committee observes from *Page 62.* from the Middle, that where the Author mentions the various Ends of the Coming of Christ into the World, and of his Death; he omits taking Notice of the greatest, and most important End, namely his Satisfaction.

Answer, If the Author has not mentioned the Satisfaction, it must at least be own'd, that he has mentioned One of the grand Effects of it, *viz.* The delivering us from the Punishments due unto us, for our Sins: Now the mentioning the principal Effect of any Thing, is very near the same Thing, as if he had mentioned the Cause itself. Signed by

WILL. LEECHMAN.

Glasgow, 4th of April 1744.

Reply, This Answer owns that Deliverance from Punishment is as really different from Christ's Satisfaction, as the Effect from the Cause.—It is notour, that there are People who affirm the one, and deny the other.—It is not meerly Mr. Leechman's not using the Term *Satisfaction*; but not owning the Thing in that Place in any equivalent Terms that is excepted against.—The Passage is a kind of implicite Thanksgiving, or Petition to be enabled to a just or thankful Sense of Christ's Love, manifested by the Ends of his Mission and Death.—Something equivalent to that heavenly Thanksgiving, *To him who loved us and washed us in his Blood*, cannot safely be omitted in such Acknowledgments.

It is perhaps one of the most exceptionable Things in this Sermon, that in Places where some explicite Regard to Redemption was plainly needful, his Way seems to be, to acknowledge merely what the known Deniers and Opposers of Redemption acknowledge, omitting what they omit.

It can never be justly pleaded, that the total Omission of his Satisfaction, expressly or in equivalent Terms, is compensated by a mere general Mention of his Mediation and Intercession.—Seeing they who deny the Doctrine of Christ's

Christ's Redemption, or Satisfaction, but own his divine Mission, are obliged to own a Kind of Intercession very different from that founded upon proper Satisfaction;—And also to own in general Terms Christ's Mediation, which they explain, by the good Influence of his Doctrine, Precepts and Example, and his Death, confirming all.—It evidently follows from this, that a general Acknowledgment of Christ's Mediation and Intercession, however good in itself, is by no means sufficient to hinder the bad Tendency of such Omission as above qualified, of his Merit and Satisfaction.

But that which yet of all others, upon this Head, hath given the greatest Offence, is, that Professor Leechman declared in the *Synod*, that the Word *Satisfaction* being a Scholastick Word, he never used it in Prayer.—And now in his Answers, he hath never once used it, but where the Remarks led him to it, he hath omitted both *it* and *Merit*.—Is not this the very way of doing of the Enemies to the Thing it self? How dangerous will it be for a Professor to leave out and not to use several Ecclesiastical Terms, sanctified by long Use, to express Doctrines expressly contained in the Holy Scriptures; and which have been found necessary to secure the Church of God against Heresy? By the same Rule he may give up the Word Trinity, and many other Words found necessary to express the Things contained and revealed in the Holy Scriptures? The Enemies to the most fundamental Truths would demand no more but this.—Is not this directly contrary to the Acts of Assembly already referred to?—Is this to hold fast the Form of sound Words? Must the Word Satisfaction be treated as a Scholastical Word, which is used in our *Confession of Faith*, and both our Catechisms? It is used in the *Shorter Catechism*, which the weakest of the People are taught, and was designed for them; but our Author never used it, in Prayer, because a Scholastick Word. And is not even this Ground of Offence and Jealousy in one called to be a Professor of Divinity, considering, that

the

the Use of it is recommended in our Directory for Worship, in publick Prayer before Sermon.

Thus I have given an exact and circumstantial Account of this unpleasant Affair; it hath been done with many Interruptions by necessary Avocations; what Escapes may be in it, are involuntary.— This now in the Conclusion, I declare that I, and others, instead of having the Offence removed from us, as the *Synod express it*, have it greatly increased by Professor *Leechman's* Answers.— It is therefore earnestly wished, that the Venerable Assembly may give such Decision in this Affair, as not to leave Truth bleeding by the Wounds she hath received, and such dangerous Ways of Teaching as have been pointed out, further to increase in this Church:— As not to leave our Brother to continue suspected of Unsoundness in the Faith, and of Disregard to the Mediatorial Scheme, as it is explained in our Standards.— As not to leave Ground to jealous his Scholars, as tainted with the same Errors, to their great Prejudice if orthodox and innocent:— Not to increase the Divisions, already so lamentable in this Church:— And finally, as not to oblige us the Appellants to enter into a Process against Mr. *Leechman*, (for those Errors we conceive are in his Sermons and Answers,) to do our Duty to prevent the mentioned Evils, leaving the Event of such a new unavoidable Process to God. That the Venerable Assembly may be led by the Holy Spirit, to such a Decision is the Prayer of,

J A. ROBE.

The Reader will please to correct the following Chronological Errors.

Page 10th Line 9th, for *April 5th*, read *March 5th*,
— Page 11th for *April 5th* read *April 2d*.

2101-A1

四

